

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Minutes

Faculty Senate Documents

2014

Faculty Senate Minutes-2014

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "Faculty Senate Minutes-2014" (2014). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 26.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-minutes/26>

This minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Faculty Senate Minutes
February 14, 2014
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: (Ellen Hamilton for Debbie Allen), Olga Amarie, (Evans Afriyie-Gyawu for Helen Bland), John Howard Brown, Sally Brown, Bob Cook, Jonathan Copeland, Robert Costomiris, Steven Elisha, Azell Francis (SGA), Frank Goforth, Hemchand Gossai, Mark Hanna, James Harris, Gregory Harwood, Pat Humphrey, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, (Clara Krug for Patrick Wheaton) Li Li, Nan LoBue, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Santanu Majumdar, Jessica Minihan, Marc Mitchell, Aniruddha Mitra, Ed Mondor, Shahn timer Navaee, Marshall Ransom, Camille Rogers, Susan Smith, Kathy Thornton, Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, Patrick Wheaton, James Woods, Lisa Yocco, (Bob Fernekes for Rebecca Ziegler)

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Tony Barilla, John Dyer, Lucy Green, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, Marla Morris, Kent Murray, Sze-man Ngai, Robert Pirro, Joe Ruhland, Lina Soares, Tiffanie Townsend, Tim Whelan

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Martha Abell, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Tom Koballa, Bede Mitchell, Charles Patterson, Curtis Ricker, Teresa Thompson, Robert Whitaker

Visitors: Barry Balleck, Larisa Elisha, Maura Copeland, Bob Fernekes, Candace Griffith, Lori Gwinett, Christine Ludowise, Michael Moore, Patrick Novotny, Rob Yarbrough

1. Approval of the Agenda for the February 13, 2014 meeting.
2. Approval of the [November 20, 2013](#) Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary
3. Approval of the [Librarian's Reports of February 13, 2014](#) Greg Harwood (CLASS), Senate Librarian
 - a. Approval of the Undergraduate Committee Report (Kathy Thornton CHHS
 - b. Approval of the Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes LIB
 - c. Approval of the General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report Greg Harwood (CLASS) Senate Librarian:
4. Provost's Report (Jean Bartels): The SACS Self-Study Group, and if you've been following, we have 15 teams of people who've been working, actually creating and writing the SACS Reaffirmation Report. That report will be due to be sent in to SACS in September. We will be running it through several iterations of readers to make sure that we are making our arguments appropriately and well. Those 15 teams have been very active and very busy collecting information, identifying areas that will need to address as we move on with the report, and the work is going very well. So the first draft is essentially done. It's now ready for review and we are having our first review with our SACS Vice President, who is our liaison and she will be reviewing next week, and she will be giving us some information and feedback on it.

The second thing that is going on with SACS is the QEP, the Quality Enhancement Plan. You remember that we had a variety of forums last year for students, faculty, and staff, multiple for those groups again, narrowed the identification of theme down to two. One was on effective writing; the other was on experiential learning. The vast majority of faculty favored the effective writing, and we had good support for that. So effective writing as a general topic was chosen as the next QEP focus. The next work on the QEP is to do a more enhanced review and best practice review where we can research around other programs, that have done programs about effective writing and we are in the phase of doing that with a group of faculty representatives of the entire institution or perhaps from every college – our staff, students, undergraduate and graduate as well on that team. A second team is going to be using that information and working with it to start to generate the first plan for development. And so that group will be kind of working parallel with the other committee. The way the QEP works is you write a self-study. A SACS team of reviewers reviews this off-site. They make recommendations, they identify areas that they think are deficit, they give out more information about it that they want the on-site visiting team to perhaps follow up on. The team that actually comes on-site and that on-site visit for us will occur in March next year – the very end of March, the first days of April. When the site team comes on campus, look to see whether you have developed a plan that's both feasible, appropriate to your own data, student learning outcomes, and is something that can be resourced, and be developed in a way that is beneficial to faculty and students. When the site team is here they'll also be looking at some of the areas they think we have deficit areas in. Rest assure, that you will all be brought back to this process as we continue to develop it because this process must be inclusive. We are very likely to try and to engage the students and perhaps a little competition in trying to identify a title for it at some point in time, too. And then they'll be bookmarks, banners, pencils, handouts, so that everybody that is on the campus literally from the staff all the way through students, faculty, are prepared to be asked about the QEP when the site visit team is on campus. The only other thing I will mention about SACS has to do with student learning outcomes. Again, this doesn't have to do with SACS, it has to do with our own institutional effectiveness and our preparation to continue to work with good practice and pedagogy. Student learning outcomes because we want to be able to develop or to document and communicate a full set of reviews for this last year, we are going to call those assessment reports in June of this year, so before faculty leave we are going to ask that this data that pertains to student learning outcomes plans is collected. We will probably try to find resources to help people that might be sticking around in June to write up those plans for their program.

The other thing that I just wanted to report very quickly is that I've been working with the Faculty Welfare Committee to look at Dean's Evaluations, five-year review planning process. We are getting extremely close to having that finalized. We have at least one of the Deans who qualify as being ready for that evaluation, so we will be able to actually test it out and implement that evaluation process already this year once you approve it.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): I'm, how do we know if effective writing as a QEP is what we need at this institution? How is that determined? Or did we just vote on it? I mean, is it just a gut feeling that that's a good idea or is it something based on data?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Actually we had a number of forums where we actually asked people where they thought we should focus on. We also looked at data. We had various sets of data, everything from surveys and information that we had that we routinely do on student capabilities as well as we had from a general education group did a pretty extensive review of written work and evaluations, so it was a combination of multiple things, primarily faculty, concerns about student writing

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): Thank you.

Clara Krug (CLASS): You mentioned that there will be research into institutions with effective writing programs, I wonder if there would be some research into what Georgia Southern's writing program used to be in the '80's

Jean Bartels (Provost): That will certainly be part of what we are planning. What I meant really was look at other institutions that have used effective writing as their QEP focus. Many of them that are very recent, who have, you know, learn some things helpful things, things that were not helpful, so that's the other part of the QEP.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Certainly we will be looking at what's happened here.

Clara Krug (CLASS): And perhaps try to figure out why it was phased out?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I don't care so much about why it was phased out; I care about where we are going to go forward

Clara Krug (CLASS): Right, but I mean what didn't work that might be improved. What could be kept so we don't throw out the baby with the bathwater?

Jean Bartels (Provost): And, again, we aren't even sure at this point, that as we just begin this work what our plan will look like, it's going to be a plan that really involves the preparation of faculty, the preparation of students, and we will see how it evolves.

Devon Jensen (COE): Provost Bartels, you mentioned in your report that the SACS student learning outcome report stated that it needed to be in by June. Just as a point of clarification, as I report back to my college, it is that June 1st, June 15th, June 30th, June 19th?

Jean Bartels (Provost): We'd like to have it done by June, which means probably by June 1, so that we can use June to do the writing.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): You mentioned that a vast majority of faculty have chosen writing over experiential learning, right? Do you have an approximate percentage? There were some people in my college wanting to know?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Not off the top of my head. I would be making it up. I can certainly get that information for you.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Thanks.

5. President's Report: (Brooks Keel, President): Dr. Bartels, thank you very much.

Weather

I appreciate everyone coming out on a Friday afternoon, and what a difference 24 hours will make. I certainly appreciate everyone's patience as we dealt with what was projected by the National Weather Service as a very serious weather event and in fact did turn out to be very severe in this part of the world with power outages and that sort of thing, so we have already met to debrief the situation and so that the next time this comes around we'll be better prepared to deal with it as we move forward, and so I do appreciate everyone's patience as we go through that.

Office Hours

A couple of issues I want to bring up to you. I had office hours several semesters ago and we do plan to do that again this semester.

Sports Education Center

Another issue that Rob asked me to talk about is that the Sports Education Center that has been approved by the Board of Regents. We are in the final stages of planning with that facility with the Board of Regents, everything from choosing architect, to consultants, and hope to have that wrapped up by the summer. I think we planned physically to start breaking ground, sometime in June.

Day at the Capitol

Last week we had "Day at the Capitol." It's the first time that Georgia Southern has had an opportunity to be at the capitol. We had a number of tables from virtually all of the colleges and other units of the university in the rotunda of the capitol. Food Services served breakfast and it's just a great opportunity for legislators, especially those that may not be from this part of the state, to learn more about Georgia Southern. I want to thank Russell Keen and his staff for helping put that together. Many of you were there and students there, it was a great opportunity to showcase and highlight Georgia Southern to our state legislators. We had two resolutions: one before the House and one before the Senate, and the two resolutions were made by our representatives and senators so it was a great opportunity for Georgia Southern to educate our legislators on the things that we do here. We hope this will become an annual event so stay tuned about this time next year and we'd sure love to have you in front of the capitol. Incidentally, while I'm on the topic, if any of you wish to see your representatives and just want someone to sort of show around or help you schedule a visit, that's one of the things that Russell Keen does. He is in Atlanta full-time when the legislation is in session, and he'd be more than happy to try to arrange meetings for you if that's something that you wish to do and it's a great opportunity we'd love to be able to take our faculty and before our delegation so that they can have a better understanding of who you are and the great representation that we have at the university.

Budget

Speaking of the capitol, the Governor passed his budget. I may have mentioned this at the last Senate meeting, but let me just bring you up-to-speed on where we are with the budget. It was basically all good news. The Governor has budgeted money in for higher education for a pay increase. Now we won't know exactly what that will translate in to Georgia Southern until we get closer to the end of the session, but certainly when the Board of Regents makes their determinations, but we have every expectation that there will be a pay increase this year. And as you all are painfully aware, much more than I am because you have been dealing with it longer than I have, it's the first pay increase in some five or six years, I think. At least five or six years, maybe longer, so we are very excited about that, and are very appreciative to the Governor who put that into the budget. As you well know, the budget goes through several processes: the Governor makes a recommendation, the House passes the budget, and they just this last week passed the budget, and that money was kept intact and that goes to the Senate for them to deliberate and they will pass the budget, and then a conference committee will be formed between the House and Senate, to work out all the disagreements, and then it goes to the Governor for signature. It will go to the Board of Regents and they will make determinations and allocations from that point, so we still have a ways to go. Nothing is carved in stone at this point, although it is getting closer every day. We will know either at the Board of Regents in April or May meeting what our allocation will be and we'll be able to move from there. Let me just say though that every indication is that the pay increase will not be great, by great I mean will not be a large amount. We think it will be 1 to 2% range, we know it will be completely merit based. What that means for us is that not everyone is guaranteed to receive anything, not everyone is guaranteed to receive the same amount, and we will be given instructions by the System office as to how to allocate pay increases, but we have on good indication that it will be merit based and everything that that implies. It will also, the Governor, when he made his budget recommendations, not only for pay increases, but also indicated he'd like to see it be used for retention, or for equity issues, and we will have an opportunity at this university to make some decisions once we get instructions from the System office, as to how to take the money we have and how we will allocate it in terms of pay increase, merit pay increase, retention, or progressing with equity and compression issues as we've already done. So I think that's basically all the information that I have on that, so will try to answer some questions along those lines and I'll ask if both Russell and Rob to weigh in if you have any questions, but that is essentially where we are with regards to the budget. Please stay tuned. We will know more as the session moves on, and we'll certainly know more once it gets to the System office.

Promotion and Tenure

Let me now, if I can, turn very quickly to promotion and tenure packets, and I'll speak for the Provost. We were extremely impressed with the promotion and tenure packets that we received over the last month or so, and I think that speaks volumes to each and every one of you in this room, and to your chairs and deans with the great deal of attention that you place on this extremely important issue. The information that we received in the packets was extremely thoughtful, was extremely objective, and unbiased in every way, we greatly appreciate that, and it's been a marked improvement on what I've seen put together in those packets and that's to your credit and your chairs and deans for the great deal of attention that you place on this hugely important issue.

Two issues need mentioning, too. The Provost and I are beginning to have conversations as to the need for external letters of recommendation. I know some of you are already doing that. The Provost and I, and I'll asked her to comment if she wants, this is an important aspect of promotion and tenure packets especially when it gets to our level, to help us when there are some discrepancy between the various colleges/department committees/the deans, chairs, etc. And we're looking at possibility if we want to go that way campus-wide. The other thing has to do with an interesting scenario we have in this System with regards to offering tenure without promotion, especially at the Assistant Professor level. We've had a number of candidates that came forward that are outstanding candidates for recommendation for tenure, but not promotion: in other words, a tenured Assistant Professor. And I think in all the cases, if I'm not mistaken, there was a technicality based on timing. So in other words the person had enough time according to the System to get tenure, but just didn't have enough years in Georgia Southern to get promotion. That just doesn't seem like a reasonable thing to me, we're going to look into the System policies to see if there is some way we can address that. For the life of me, I can't understand why we would want to give someone tenure but not promote them and in all the instances these candidates were outstanding as I recall and would every measure deserve promotion, but because of the technicality, couldn't get it so we would like to make that much easier opportunity and more straightforward opportunity for you and your colleagues as we move forward. So those are just two issues that have come up and this promotion and tenure cycle and again thank all of you for the extraordinary work that you put into these packets and evaluation of your colleagues.

Mark Welford (COSM): I have a question pertaining to the budget. Are we still going to receive a \$4 million cut from the Board of Regents?

Brooks Keel (President): That's a great question. Again, and the answer, we just don't know yet. If you recall in the original discussion I had there were some campuses in the System that had an enrollment increase, which resulted in a \$40 million plus in the System, some campuses had a plus enrollment and a \$20 million deficit, some had a plus enrollment that \$20 million at the bottom of the line was a deficit of \$20 million. The Governor recommended that \$20 million be made whole, which is good news. That still has to go through the process that I mentioned. And it has to go to the Board of Regents and the BOR still has to make determinations of how to pass on that allocation. There is still a very real possibility of we may be forced to contribute towards a cut that will go to offset some of the other campuses in the System that have such a horrendous enrollment decreases that there is significant financial issues, so we won't know that until we get to the allocations the Board of Regents will make as I said after April or May. We are hoping it will be in April, but we just won't know until that point in time. We are expecting to have some sort of cut regardless; I'm hoping it won't be a 5%.

James Woods (CLASS): I just have a question about the merit, it's been about six years, since it's been six years since we received a pay increase. Is the merit going to be covered over those six years or is it only going to be in the past year? A reason, for example, is someone has published a book, in 2010 or 2011, is that going to be considered as part merit or are we going to do 2012-2013 in consideration of merit?

Brooks Keel (President): Again, another great question, and I think it's really just too early for us to be able make those determinations. We haven't really begun that conversation, the Provost and I, at the cabinet level, and also she will speak with the deans with respect to how we might dole that money back out to the various units. And we haven't had a conversation as to what we feel is more important to address merit, or retention, or to address compression issues. I think all of those things will factor into this. Just so you know, I think right now what I'd like to be able to do is to be able to address all of it. I'd like to be able to continue to chip away the compression issues. I'd like to be able to be able to award merit really outstanding individuals. We are just going to have to see what the magnitude of the money is before we can make those determinations. And also how much flexibility the System is going to be able to give us.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): Unless anyone else wishes to speak. Just a follow-up on Jamie Woods, I'm curious to know what you would tell the faculty member or anybody on this campus so that after 6 years if they don't get a raise this year, how you would tell them that they don't, even though the money is here, they're not getting anything. What would you say?

Brooks Keel (President) Well, then I would, again, those are just decisions that "supervisors" are going to, to be honest with you, to have such a small amount of money, they really won't see 1 to 2% is not that great an amount of money. It's roughly \$2 million.

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business and Finance): Each 1% is about a one million dollar expense to the University.

Brooks Keel (President) I think it's \$1.1, it's roughly \$2 million, you know, that's not an awful lot. It's hard to do a merit, really give a merit, when you've got 5 to 50 employees. I mean the easy thing is across the board. If we had got 5%, now you've got a lot of flexibility to do some things in some creative ways to address cost-of-living, etc. The money is just not going to be great enough to do it. I think the good news right now is that we going to be able to give a pay increase.

Olga Amarie (CLASS): I have a question about merit based, is merit also considered excellence in teaching and service, or just research?

Brooks Keel (President): Oh, no, no, and, again, that would be really up to the supervisor, so if it would be a director or a chair or a dean, but no, from my perspective they would be given latitude in terms of what merit is. Merit at this university is from the faculty point of view is research and service and teaching and in varying degrees based off of what the teaching load the individual has in terms of what the expectation is for the other aspects of that they workload.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): Question about the director of the shooting center, could you give us an update on how that's going and what qualifications you are seeking for the person to fill that role?

Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management): We are obviously looking at that position. We are started advertising. Only problem we are having is that the integrated review has caused us to have to wait a little bit longer. It will have to be someone who's qualified in range management. That's part of the scenario that's being used with the Sports Shooting Center, so that means that they have gotten certification and certain training and all those type things, and then obviously someone who can also pull together from the archery world, because that's about 75% of what they will do. So it will be a combination of those, but will have experience in running those type of operations or training in those areas.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): Dr. Thompson is this a national search?

Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management): It is a national search.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): And while we are on this subject, I heard that there was some discussion about changing the entrance to the Shooting Sports Center to the Bypass is that, is there any validity to that?

Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management): No, the Department of Transportation controls that access so may have to come in where we are talking about now on Old Register, but remember when you say that, it's about what 25 yards or less off there so you're almost right there at the Bypass.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): Thank you very much.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair. The SEC met with Rob Whitaker, the VP for Business and Finance about a week ago. And we had a nice conversation and asked a lot of questions and some of them things that came from that I just wanted to share for clarifications to a lots of different items that we all had questions about. The issue of cutting the budget of Georgia Southern, we often talk about as if its linked to the decline in physical numbers of students, 57 students this year, etc., but Rob clarified that its related to a loss over the last couple of years or a decline in credit hours to the tune of about 6,000 credit hours, and that seems to be what's really driving the sense that the budget cut that needs to go ahead. We one of 22 institutions that was asked to prepare those cuts. If the cuts are not made to the tune of 5%, money would be redirected on campus. We talked a little bit about summer money and you know the way summer money has all been talked about is a very distinct budget which seems to be, but we also learned that there is no absolute restriction that its summer money be kept distinct from other monies used throughout the year. Am I correct in saying that, Rob Whitaker? Okay, thank you. We asked about the surcharge for online classes and how much that generated. And just out of curiosity it generates \$2.8 million a year, \$1.9 goes to academic affairs, \$460,000 goes to administrator functions, and \$380,000 goes into a strategic reserve. The institutional fee paid by students generates \$14 million a year. And one of the last things that we asked was about the Sunbelt Football fee and the athletic facility fee, whether those provisions have any sunset. Anyway, the SEC asked Dr. Keel for a meeting with Dr. Keel this has been scheduled for March 7th,

and we're also trying to schedule a meeting between the SEC, Dr. Bartels, and Rob Whitaker to talk about summer monies and how we might kind of resolve some of those issues. Moving on, one of the issues that the SEC has had to address is the formulation and issuance of the University policies. You may be aware that University *Statutes* have been revised. Those also were brought to the SEC after Dr. Keel asked that the SEC look at the Statutes. We made some recommendations; they've now gone back to the committee that originally made the original revisions to. The last thing I wanted to say is the Ad Hoc Committee that is dealing with the student ratings of instruction currently has a survey out amongst faculty and so please complete that survey online.

7. Motions Approved:

- 7.1. Revisions to "[Faculty Grievance Committee Policies and Procedures](#)" Bob Fernekes (LIB): I can highlight a couple of items that would be of significance that the entire review process was based on Michael Moore's letter which was attached to the motion request and nominations by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. President Keel formed the ad hoc committee which I chaired, to review the Faculty Grievance Committee Policies and Procedures. The committee's charge was to review the procedures in light of the committee chair's concerns and issues to see what changes were needed. The last substantive review was 10 years ago, so that's what got the process started.

The changes that we developed can be grouped into two categories. The first one's the easy part, the technical and the second information and documentation. Technical changes consist of changes in membership, under the current system we have regular and an alternate members which posed a problem when a regular member had a conflict of interest with the policy/procedures was written that they could not serve on a plenary session, so basically we ran individuals that could serve in full capacity. So that was changed so that all members of the committee now are eligible to serve on a plenary session and subsequent editing the document to ensure that we changed all of the applicable sections. And as fate would have it, there will be a need for a friendly amendment to correct an editing slip on line 90 ~~strikeout the phrase "regular or alternate"~~ and the word "regular" on lines 93 and 101. Because

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): Bob, make the motion first and then

Bob Fernekes (LIB) From the outset and during the review there was collaboration between administrators and faculty, primarily President Keel and Maura Copeland, Legal Counsel, and among faculty, primarily the focus was on clarifying the information and documentation needs supporting the grievance process as reflected in the final draft. So there are some insertions in the final draft that speak to that. In a nutshell, evidence-based decision making everything documented. So working with the administration and faculty has brought us to this point and we welcome any questions and comments and I will turn to my colleagues for additional detail as required.

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): So now you need to make a motion.

Bob Fernekes (LIB): Yes, I would make the motion since I'm sitting in for Rebecca Ziegler, so a motion to approve the final committee draft of the Faculty Grievance Committee Procedures Section 220 of the Georgia Southern University *Faculty Handbook*. (seconded)

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Discussion?

Clara Krug (CLASS): Is this an appropriate time to make the friendly amendment?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Yes it would be.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I would like to make the following friendly amendment to the motion which has been made and seconded that on line 90 that the words "regular or alternate" be deleted. On line 93 the word "regular" be deleted. And on line 101 the word "regular" be deleted. The rationale is that there are no more regular or alternate members there are only members.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Clara, can you give us the line numbers again?

Clara Krug (CLASS): Line 90 to delete "regular or alternate;" line 93 to delete "regular;" and line 101 to delete "regular"

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay.

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): Is that okay with you, Bob? If its friendly, you have to be friendly, too.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: You have to accept the friendly amendment.

Bob Fernekes (LIB): Say again?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: You have to accept the friendly amendment.

Bob Fernekes (LIB): Yes, I accept the friendly amendment, and I have a copy here as well.

Clara Krug (CLASS): He asked me to make it, so I guess he did.

Bob Fernekes (LIB): Thank you.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So are there any other amendments? Yes.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I wanted to draw your attention to line 52-53, which asks that the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee be notified within 15 days of any receipt of changes essentially to the Board of Regents *Bylaws*, if they are changed. I would just like to now indicate that that will virtually impossible to do. Because we are not always, or sometimes, ever, notified until it just appears. So we could be in violation of this most immediately because we can't deal with the 15 day notification on a routine basis to be consistent. I offer a recommendation that perhaps we would just say that the Grievance Committee would be notified of any changes as appropriate.

Clara Krug (CLASS): My interpretation of that particular sentence is not that the administration would notify the Faculty Grievance Committee within 15 days, but that the Faculty Grievance Committee's doing something, but within 15 days of receiving word from the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia of a change in the *Bylaws* and Policies, so that, for example, if the administration of Georgia Southern received information about that on February 17, within 15 days they would notify the Faculty Grievance Committee of those changes so it would be really a vocal notification, which could be accomplished by, I guess, an email, so that there would be written documentation.

Jean Bartels (Provost): It's not routine that the Board notifies of a change, we may find out about a change if there was Board of Regents' meeting, we could potentially find out at that time, if there was a change, but they don't routinely send us changes to policy.

Clara Krug (CLASS): However, if that notification were forthcoming, the Faculty Grievance Committee could be notified. I think if you receive no notification then this still would apply, if you did receive notification.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So Clara what you are suggesting is that it may not be an issue?

(Clara Krug) (CLASS): I think if you leave it and then you pray that the Board of Regents changes over time and actually does notify the campuses on a regular basis so that they may share it with the committee, right? I just keep praying, I've been here a long time, but I keep hoping that they will do that, and then it makes it easier for our administrators to keep in touch with us about these changes.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So Dr. Bartels, are you content on leaving this as is?

Jean Bartels (Provost): That's just fine.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Any further discussion?

Devon Jensen (COE): Clarification to understand the process here a little bit. So just kind of beginning around row 45, in the document, so a particular individual has a

grievance, they go to their department chair, can't be resolved there, so they then go to the dean of the appropriate college, the mediation process is brought into place and it is not resolved at that point in time, and so after that point in time, if I'm reading it correctly, then the Faculty Grievance Committee can step in. Is there a procedure there to like once it can't be resolved at the dean's level, is that particular individual notified or informed that they can now go to the Faculty Grievance Committee to begin a continuation of their grievance? I don't see that mentioned anywhere or I'm not sure how that actually happens.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Can anyone address that who is on the committee?

Clara Krug (CLASS): I served as chair for approximately 10 years. Typically what happens, Devon, is that there is an effort to resolve the issue at what we would call the, for lack of a better word, the lowest possible level, the most initial level, is maybe more appropriate rather than the lowest, so you would start with your department chair, if it was not a positive result of the faculty member's standpoint, he/she would continue with the dean, the dean would let him/her know the decision, and then if the faculty member were not pleased by the decision, the faculty member would let the chair of the Faculty Grievance Committee know, and there is a list of items that the person would have to present to the Faculty Grievance chair, the chair and the person would meet with the Provost to see what other avenues there might be, which could include mediation or something else. And then if that was not something that the faculty member wanted to pursue he/she would then go to the Faculty Grievance Committee. I think that that's all in here; I think it may be a little bit further along.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Just a little bit of clarification, having served on the Committee for three or four years now. Oftentimes, it's really not feasible for a grieved faculty member to try to negotiate with their chair or even their dean because typically the grievance is against the chair or the dean, for some action they took, so therefore you're stuck with really going to the Provost or the Grievance Committee.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Thank you. Any

Devon Jensen (COE): And for that grieved faculty member are they, how do they get information in terms of who they contact regarding the Faculty Grievance Committee?

Pat Humphrey (COSM): It's on the University web pages. All they'd have to do is search for the Faculty Grievance or it's also in the *Faculty Handbook* in terms of that.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Thank you.

Clara Krug (CLASS): It begins on line 176, initiating formal proceedings and it continues through 199. And that includes the items that I mentioned that individual must produce and then proceed to the initial hearing and the investigation, etc. So the information is here. I think what's, I think sometimes faculty members, newer faculty

members perhaps may not think to consult the *Faculty Handbook*, but I know that various Senate Executive Committees have tried very diligently include all of the policies that affect faculty members and which faculty members may use on their behalf. We even initiated a couple of years ago including the Board of Regents' Policy for dismissal of tenured faculty member in the *Handbook*, had not been included so anybody who wanted to find out if he/she could do had to plow through the online policies. We had a colleague year's ago who used to tell us he had a copy of the policies that he would read before going to bed at night, just so he could sleep well. So we try to put it here easily for people to read. And I want to thank the Provost because the one time this *Handbook* was online and that was the only access and I'm a firm believer in carrying a hard copy so that you can refer to it at a public meeting because sometimes the projected copy in a room with this unfortunate lighting is not easy for older members of this particular group, like myself, to read clearly.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: All in favor of approving the Faculty Grievance Procedures as amended, say aye. Opposed? *Approved as amended.*

7.2. Policy on [Distance Education](#)

All right. I'm on to 7.2 Policy on Distant Education. This is a policy that Dr. Bartels sent to the SEC and we looked at and decided we could not approve it alone, and so we bring it to the full Senate for your approval. And so may I have a motion to approve this or to approve this Policy on Distance Education?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Just what we are doing with a number of these policies is trying to get in place with our procedures and practices required for SACS, for accreditations.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): I have a question possibly for Dr. Bartels. It came up at our SEC discussion on Monday, the University charges and extra fees for students taking these online distance learning courses, faculty don't see any of that, has there ever been any talk about paying faculty a little extra when they teach an online course?

Jean Bartels (Provost): No discussion about increasing the salary of a faculty member teaching an online course, but the premium tuitions that generate from online courses actually all of that money goes back to supporting the units in which those programs are being offered.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So all in favor of approving this Policy on Distance Education, say aye? Opposed? *Approved*

All right thank you very much. We're on # 8 now, on the agenda, so we're here to discuss now the discussion or rather the Formulation and Issuance of University Policies.

8. Discussion of "[Formulation and Issuance of University Policies](#)" (Robert Costomiris, Maura Copeland): Maura Copeland and her office has been working with Dr. Keel and with the SEC

over the past few months. And the, just to give a little background on this, the University wishes to have, as many universities do, a kind of central policy that embraces or encompasses all other policies. So we have discussed many amendments to this, many amendments have been made to this document as you can see. The issue still, from the SEC, is there is an issue of whether this document was in compliance with the Board of Regents' Policy 3.2.4 which basically gives academic policy, puts academic policy in the hands of the faculty. And this policy here as its currently written, at points, seems, it gives the President's Cabinet the privilege of voting on those policies which we don't feel is actually the way 3.2.4, or at least 3.2.4's intent. So that's in a nutshell where things stand.

Maura Copeland (Office of Legal Affairs): Just to kind of give you some background. It's not that we just wanted to make this policy; it's one of those SACS things that one of their standards that says you need to demonstrate that you have control over your policies and what gets to be made an actual policy in the University. Part of what I did when I was drafting this was go take a look at other universities how they do it. Many of them did have a policy committee. We don't have such a committee here; it's something you would have to create. And rather than do that, many of their committees are similar to the President's Cabinet in that they had a representative from every unit of the University. In our case, the President's Cabinet is made up of all of the Vice Presidents, so everybody under them reports up to one of the Vice Presidents and that's why I used the President's Cabinet. As you can see from that now that with the revisions the President's Cabinet would not be voting on whether to put something in place or not, they would just be looking at the policy and making a recommendation as to whether there's any other policies that exist in another unit, that might be in competition and I felt like that was the best way for us to get a comprehensive look at policies, you know, if Business & Finance is going to bring one that conflicts with something Faculty Senate is doing, this is the way that we can kind of see it at a comprehensive level and address it before it gets to be made a policy, put up on a website, and everyone's expected to follow it.

Clara Krug (CLASS): I have a couple of concerns. Three specifically. Page one, Section III, E. University Policy, Item 2, "Contains guidelines for governance and sets limits within which people are expected to operate." And when I see governance, I immediately think of faculty members and I specifically think of the Faculty Senate. And so my next question to the same subsection Item 4, "Has been reviewed and approved by the President's Cabinet; and", and number 5, "Is sponsored by at least one Vice President or by the President." My question there is how about the Senate because we have no full-time faculty member serving on the President's Cabinet. Our representative is the Provost and that person is an academic, however, we don't have a full-time faculty member, we have various vice presidents, perhaps I don't know, Deans, I've lost track of the membership because I just have. So that's my question. How about the Senate?

Section IV: Procedures, A. Proposing and Developing a Policy, Item 3. "If the unit or department does not report, directly or indirectly, to a Vice President, drafts must be submitted directly to the President. In the case of drafts being recommended by the Faculty Senate, drafts must be submitted directly to the President in accordance with Board of Regents policy." This is pretty much what happens now. Because the Senate Executive

Committee makes proposals, and the Senate makes policy, but we “advise,” in a similar format to the Senate in DC. So I don’t have a problem with that. Not yet anyway.

Item B. Reviewing and Approving a Policy Item 1, “If the President or Vice President determines that the policy should be considered for implementation, he or she will distribute the draft to the Office of Legal Affairs and to all members of the President’s Cabinet for review.” Now, Maura you said that the Cabinet doesn’t vote, recommends, but when you say in that sentence that if it is going to be considered for implementation, see to me implementation and recommendation are different. Implementation to me is as if you took a vote and started forward with it. So I would like to see something from a thesaurus or from a really good, not a Wikipedia, but a really good dictionary about the difference between voting, among voting, recommending and implementing. And my question there about distributing the draft to the Office of Legal Affairs, is before or after discussion at a Senate meeting?

So I see the need early on to have the Senate involved in this and I think SACs would be happy as a clam to see that there would be Senate involvement early on because I know there is sections of the SACS review that focus on involvement of faculty members and I think this would be a great way to include us. Thank you.

Maura Copeland (Office of Legal Affairs): Clara, that first thing that you pointed out “approved” that’s where I overlooked to changing all of them to a recommendation. Somebody here might could that.

Maura Copeland (Office of Legal Affairs): Sure, Section III, E. 4, where it says “approved” that’s just an overlook, I overlooked changing it from approved, this has been kind of a back-and-forth with me and the SEC, so all the changes certainly haven’t gotten made at this point and that is one of them I just overlooked changing it to recommended.

Clara Krug (CLASS): My other one was about the implementation

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: In 4. A. 3, I think that is an issue there. I mean, I think the main point to raise in this discussion today is basically to make everyone aware that in this, the crafting of this policy on policies, is a very important document because it sets, any document can be changed, I know, but it sets a kind of a system whereby, this is how we make decisions. And it’s very important I think that we not put a policy in place that does not allow for the Faculty Senate to make recommendations directly to the Senate, no intermediaries whatsoever, and that there’s no voting on what, there’s no voting at the cabinet level of what happens with the Faculty Senate recommendations. That cannot be according to the BOR policies. So I think somehow this document has to reflect those in whatever form you can write it, that’s I think where we need to go.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): One thing that we talked about a lot and you’re the lawyer, I’m not, but wouldn’t it be somewhat cleaner to say responsibility for faculty or for policies in these

areas pursuant to the BOR policy 3.2.4 lies with the Faculty Senate and then approval by the President. All other policies, therefore, would then follow this procedure?

Brooks Keel (President): You won't find the word "voting" anywhere in this document at all that I'm aware of since we've looked at it. We can wordsmith this thing to death and recommend this, that, or the other. It's very clear that the Faculty Senate sends directly to the President. I'm not going to have anything in this policy that tells the Faculty Senate is supposed to do prior to sending it directly to the President. That is certainly your purview and there are reams of other information that can give guides to what the Faculty Senate should do with that. Once it comes and it's in the President, I am not going to approve any proposal, any policy without getting info from the President's Cabinet. I don't think anybody in their right mind would want me, too, and that's exactly what this document is saying. That the Faculty Senate sends directly to me, because as per *Bylaws*, I then will get the recommendations from the President's Cabinet, and then I'm going to make the final decision. There is no voting by the President's Cabinet. But there are going to make a recommendation. That's just the way it is. So I, I appreciate your comments, and the corrections that Maura indicated we can most certainly make, but we can spend years debating, wordsmithing to the point that we will never get anything done. The implications are clear that the Faculty Senate sends directly to the President, I will get recommendations from the PC, and I will be the one that makes the final decision.

Clara Krug (CLASS): Could I asking a question? So Dr. Keel, if for example, as delineated elsewhere in this document the President's Cabinet recommends a policy that had not come from the Senate, but you were talking about a particular issue and you all recommended the policy, that would affect faculty, then would you feel that it would be incumbent upon you to bring it to the Senate? That would be my only concern, because I can imagine that there would be situations where the President's Cabinet might devise a policy, the Senate had never proposed it, because the Senate Executive Committee had never even thought of it. But would you then consult the Senate before you would recommend that? That was why I was indicating earlier on the governance part including the Senate because I was assuming there might be that kind of situation.

Brooks Keel (President): No, and I think it's plain that any policy that comes forward and has to deal with the academic issues that the Faculty Senate is involved in would have input from the Faculty Senate. Now, does that mean every single policy comes forward is going to go to the Faculty Senate no. And I don't think that's what you're asking.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Dr. Keel, I missed that last part of your statement.

Brooks Keel (President): Just to rephrase it, obviously any policies that come forward to the President's Cabinet, or come from anything that directly impacts the issues that this body is responsible for, or would have input from this body, that's one reason that having the President's Cabinet be the ones that make recommendations and gives the Provost an opportunity to say now, wait a minute, you're about to approve a policy that has direct impact on the academic side and that's something the Faculty Senate should do. And that

maybe something that one of the other Vice Presidents or even me would not have any feel for. So that's I think it's a great example of why it is so important for the President's Cabinet to review all these policies, so we can make sure every single constituent across this campus is considered before a policy can move forward.

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): I think one possible way of addressing concerns is to just look at the *Bylaws*. In Article I, Section 1, it says "As such, it shall serve as the official faculty advisory body to the President." The question that President Keel could solicit other advice in any way he wanted is perfectly within his rights to formulate a policy as to how he might collect the advice whether its voting or slips of paper or whatever. But it says "shall serve as the official faculty advisory body to the President," and I think that would be a helpful addition to the document and it then goes on to say that "with the approval of the President, the recommendations of the Faculty Senate shall be the academic policy of the University." And then it defines what that means "responsible in formulating policies and reviewing procedures include academic activities, general educational policy of the University, the welfare of the faculty, and other matters which maintain and promote the best interests of the faculty and the University as specified in the *Policy Manual of the Board of Regents*." So, I think like three sentences from the *Bylaws of the Faculty Senate* would reiterate what role the faculty is and any other portion of the document dealing with advisory councils independent of faculty advice is not our purview.

Mark Hanna (COBA): I have a question with regard to communication of policies and more particularly with regard to communication and revisions or new policies that are under consideration. The document you provided requires communication of policy changes, but it would be very possible that policies under consideration could be spiked or not approved without comment or info coming from faculty. Is that true or how would you respond to that? How would faculty know what policies are under consideration if they didn't come through the Senate channel?

Maura Copeland (Office of Legal Affairs): I think kind of in a conversation over here; policies are going, you are going to know once it comes through the Faculty Senate. If they affect faculty the President or the Provost if something comes that hasn't come through the Faculty Senate, it would have to identify, or one of the other Vice Presidents, to say hey, wait a minute, this was supposed to go through Senate and that's how you would know. There is a line added in here that if a policy is not approved, you will get an explanation of why it was not approved. Otherwise, if you put one up and it is approved, it's approved and you will find out when I send you an email that says here's the new policy, and we will have the electronic depository at some point, Robert, I sent you the temporary link today in an email.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: New business?

9. Discussion of "[Changes to the Balance of Faculty Responsibilities](#)"
10. Unfinished Business-None
11. New Business

Olga Amarie (CLASS): Maybe this was discussed before but not since I'm a Senator, so I'm going to ask this question. What additional changes we will see on Georgia Southern campus

since we are going to build a new Shooting Center? Are there going to be any security gates at each entrance or any changes done to our buildings?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Olga, these have been discussed at length in other meetings before last year and the previous year and I believe, I don't know, Dr. Thompson, is there any of this information online like the plans and stuff, can people look at those?

Theresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management): There is some plans for the building on the Recreational site, but you can also go back to the Faculty Senate minutes and read pages and pages and pages of the response.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So there is a lot of documentation. There was a lot of discussion here within the last couple of years about that. Clara, do you have a,

Clara Krug (CLASS): Mine was new business. I'm speaking on behalf of Professor Carolyn Bryant, Professor of Music, she gave this to me today. She wanted me to inquire about a concern the basis for her concern is the fact that the BA in Music was cut due to low graduation numbers in the program. She states that the degree does not require any unique course work. That it adds to FTEs in the Music Department, it adds numbers in other departments, such as Foreign Languages, and the Liberal Arts education that it prepares students for teaching, is a novel concept, it enables students to double major, and it prepares students for graduate study program that we do not offer at Georgia Southern. So she asked me to ask two questions on her behalf. One of them is that the Department of Music faculty members were told that other BA's have been cut and what BA's have been cut and the second question is in the cases of these BA's are they also degrees which do not require unique courses, but actually contribute to a department's FTE.

Chris Ludowise in the Associate Dean of CLASS: The BA in Music has not been cut yet. The forms have not gone through. We have actually asked the department to justify it. I know of one student who is a double major, she's an Anthropology and Music and she's graduating. So right now they have zero students in that program. So that answer is for the first question I think. The BA in Sociology has been cut; the BS is still in place. The BA in Psychology was cut, but those both were done 5-7 years ago. And then I think the BA in Communication Arts was cut that did go into effect this year, and that was done because an external review that the department had come in during their comprehensive program review that demonstrated that that program is not available at any university, it was more of a catch-all and it didn't have students really going into that program.

12. Announcements: Vice Presidents

13. Announcements from the Floor

14. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate Minutes
March 10, 2014
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Debbie Allen, Olga Amarie, Tony Barilla, Helen Bland, Sally Ann Brown, Jonathan Copeland, Robert Costomiris, Steven Elisha, Azell Francis (SGA), Frank Goforth, Hemchand Gossai, Lucy Green, Mark Hanna, (Derek Larson for Helena Hernandez), Pat Humphrey, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, Li Li, Nan LoBue, Jessica Minihan, Ed Mondor, Marla Morris, Kent Murray, (Youming Li for Shahnava Navaee), Robert Pirro, (Valentin Soloiu for Mosfequr Rahman), Marshall Ransom, Camille Rogers, Sabrina Ross, Joe Ruhland, Susan Smith, Lina Soares, Janice Steirn, Kathy Thornton, Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, Patrick Wheaton, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: John Dyer, Jim Harris, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Santanu Majumdar, Marc Mitchell, Aniruddha Mitra, Linda Mullen, Sze-man Ngai, Tiffanie Townsend, Tim Whelan, James Woods, Lisa Yocco

Administrators: Brooks Keel, Martha Abell, Jean Bartels, Steve Burrell, Barry Joyner, Christine Ludowise, Bede Mitchell, Charles Patterson, Curtis Ricker, Rob Whitaker

Visitors: Bob Fernekes, Stephanie Myers, Sammie Vanlandingham, Candace Griffith, Michael Moore, Stephanie Hunczak, Leanne Sylvia, Brad Field, David McConnell, Amy Zieziula, Jess Turuc, Alton M. Standifer

1. Approval of the Agenda for the March 10, 2014 meeting. Approved

- 2. Approval of the [February 14, 2014 Minutes](#): Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary:** I seek approval for the last Faculty Senate minutes with the understanding that we had incredible difficulty trying to hear what was said, and there might be errors and if anybody has any errors, please tell me now.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Just a very trivial typo, evidently, a parenthesis has been left out in the first line of the people attending [\[editorial correction: that has been corrected on the February minutes, as well as adding people who signed the attendance sheets\]](#) that makes it unclear who's substituting for whom, who is the alternate for whom, so just add that in.

Mark Welford (COSM): Thank you. I'll do that.

Mark Welford (COSM): Could I seek approval for the amended minutes, please? **Approved**

- a. Librarian's Reports of [February 13, 2013](#) Greg Harwood (CLASS), Senate Librarian. Approved**
- b. Undergraduate Committee Report (Kathy Thornton): *Approved***
 - c. Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes) *Approved***
 - d. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report (June Joyner) *Approved***

- 3. Provost's Report (Jean Bartels):** A couple of things I'd like to report to you today. The Executive Committee asked that I just do a little more explanation about and a couple that I think are new that I just would like you to have awareness of. Let me start with summer pay and summer salaries and summer paychecks.

Summer Pay, Summer Salaries, Summer Paychecks

We had a good discussion about summer pay, and I'm sure you'll hear more about that and I'm not going to go into the detail of all of the things we talked about, but I did want to clarify something about the distribution of summer employment sheets which tell you tentatively at least what your teaching assignment is and what your salary would be for that assignment. What I want to review with you is the system that we are required to use courtesy, I think it probably was developed at Georgia State, and I guess it works really good for them, we think it works a little less helpfully for us, but nevertheless, have to use this system. It's called [PPGRA](#), any of you that are department heads probably are fully aware of that because that's the form you need to fill out and the way we need to record into BANNER what it is that is happening with our summer schedules. The way that the timeline will work for PPGRA is that departments are going to have the faculty assignments to courses in BANNER by April 28th. I think most of that is pretty much in there already. The data is going to be reported then to PPGRA on April 28th. I am giving you these dates to give you a sense of the context of how this plays out and when things are available and what time they are not available. Between then and May 6th, the departments are going to have the opportunity to review, update, and approve what is in PPGRA in terms of appointments. That is extremely early, and we know that things can happen, so there is things built into the timeline system that will allow changes to be made as we get closer to the last time that students can get registered into courses.

The bottom-line here is that the colleges will distribute tentative summer employment sheets, outlining summer teaching assignments to faculty on May 7th. We tried to bump those dates as far ahead as we could of when the actual first term May starts to give people something in their hands that actually shows them what it is that we expect will be their teaching assignment and the pay for that assignment.

Now the issue of really, and I just want to speak to this for a second, because last year we had some delay in or sometimes it didn't happen for people, but its two-fold reasons for that. One was that some of our newer personnel who were just getting used to using PPGRA didn't understand and know that they had to print off those papers themselves and get them to faculty, so I apologize for all of those people and it was quite a few of them.

The second was that we had the dates close, we tried to get the dates closer to when school actually started for summer session in order to make sure that we had as many students enrolled as we possibly could, and that created some delay as well. So understand that this year we are going to try to get those summer employment sheets, and they're not contracts, they are summer employment sheets, indicating your teaching assignment and tentative and your expected pay for that out to you by May 7th. Understand what I said, this is tentative, because what happens after that is between the 7th and 10th and 14th of May, departments actually can submit any changes as we get more students enrolled, we get closer to those dates, so there could be some corrections. Those have to come in to my office. They have to be verified and rectified as they need to be for review, and then it isn't until June 3rd that we actually send the colleges a spreadsheet to produce a final information sheet, which means that that's about the time that a final definitive information sheet would be available. Again, it's a function of the PPGRA system, and unfortunately we get stuck with those dates, and I know I get things to you a little later. But we are trying, and in the conversation that I had with the Executive Committee, my expectation is that chairs have talks with their faculty, and let faculty know well ahead of getting an information sheet even of what is going to be happening with the courses that they are teaching in the summer and what they can be expecting, so I will continue to reinforce them with deans and chairs as they continue to get closer to summer, but wanted you to know that we are stuck with a system that is not as flexible or as friendly as what we used to do, when we used to have actual pieces of paper that we worked on and pieces of paper that we handed out. We now have to be held into this

system. It does tie into what happens with ADP, our favorite three letters in the alphabet, and unfortunately again some of those things are just out of our control. But my commitment is that we have information to you as early as we possibly can. It looks like that earliest that I can get that to happen is May 7th – when you get something actually given to you. I do want to avoid people already into their teaching assignments and sometimes at the end of their teaching assignments finally of getting some confirmation of what it is that's going to happen with their salaries. I do appreciate that shouldn't happen.

December and May Paychecks

To stay on the salary and paycheck level: You'll love this news as well, I am pretty sure. FY '15 payroll checks are going to have a little bit of a different fall out for when you get paid in December and in May. We used to cut December checks early. We can't do that anymore. So starting in FY '15 your December check and your May check will both come on the last day of the month. That will be in your contracts so you will have that notification again, but I wanted you to have early awareness of that because for some you it represents a change. It doesn't represent a change for people who are coming in because they haven't had the experience of getting mid-December or mid-May check. But starting FY '15, which would be your next academic year, be looking for your paychecks again to be issued on the last day of the month December and May. Just as they are for other months.

Quality Matters

I want to talk to you a little bit to about a project that is starting on campus now, actually, and I know some of you have heard about it, particularly if you teach online courses. One of the requirements that we have, and its good practice obviously no matter who tells you you should or shouldn't do it, is to be doing a consistent online review of all of our online courses for multiple things. To tell whether our courses are first off compatible, or actually have the same things in them and the same rigor as on-the-ground courses of the same type, and to make sure that they are doing things that are required by law, such as being accessible from the first day that they are put up for anyone who might come into the course, so in order to meet that requirement, we are going to start and also to help inform us about what kinds of resources do we need to put around faculty, what kinds of resources do we need for programs, what kinds of help and assistance do we need, we're going to do a review of every single online course that is offered on the campus. Now, my experience since I've been sitting in the Provost's chair and looking at online course development, is that some of it we've done extremely well, and we've had very good faculty engagement, people have some to take advantage of resources to make sure their online courses were meeting expectations, not only pedagogically, but also in terms of requirements for platform and for construction. But we have a whole lot of folks, more than I had hoped to find, who just kind of serendipitously decided that their course was now going to be online and they didn't have the benefit of all that good resource development to get those courses inline. So we have a whole mix and range of how our online courses look and how they behave and we need to get a better understanding of what it is that's going on with all of those courses. So most of you heard probably through your chairs, through your deans, that we're going to start to look at every single one of our online courses, against something called "Quality Matters" – it's a rubric and it actually, probably is the gold standard for what happens with online course development in the country. Quality Matters is a group, it's an organization and its mission is several-fold, and I want to read it to you because it will tell you why we made the decision to choose their format to actually do a review with. Their whole purpose is to work together to ensure and improve the quality of online education and student learning by developing research supported best practice-based quality standards and appropriate evaluation tools and procedures that are researched and are studied to recognize the experts in online education, quality insurance, and evaluation to foster institutional acceptance and integration of those standards and processes into how our organization improves efforts

focused on improving the quality of our online education. It's a way that we can provide faculty with development training to use not only these tools, but also to look at quality practices to improve quality of online and hybrid courses and to provide quality assurance by recognizing the quality of online education. We are going to use QM as a start point to get an idea of what's happening in our online courses because it is the gold standard. We have quite a number of our faculty who are now working in CT₂ in the Center for Online Learning who have been associated with QM, Quality Matters, and who have an understanding and awareness of the kind of rubric that they are going to use to look at those online courses. So the question had come why did we choose that? That's why we chose it because if we are going to do a review of any kind, it's going to be picking what's the best supported evidence-based way of looking at what's happening with online education at our institution. Now, we are not doing this review so that we can start putting hammers down on faculty members' heads. The purpose of the review really, first is to give us some sense of where we have real issues. I'm most concerned about the accessibility issues right now because federal law requires that if you teach a course online that it must meet accessibility standards regardless if you have a student with a learning disability in your course or not. Translated simply, and it's not simple, believe me, is that those courses all have to, if you have a video, it has to be captioned; if you have a math equation, it has to be touched so that the words to talk about that equation are put forward, and a whole other variety of things that have to be in place in anything that is presented online. That's a requirement we have to meet. We're pretty sure we're far away from that. Most faculty really believe, and I really think I was probably one of those for a long time, that until I had a student who had a learning disability, I really didn't have to worry about any of those things. But actually federal requirement is that that has to be there before the student even tells you they have a disability because it takes too long after the fact to try to put those disability issues in place. So that's only one reason of many that we're looking at courses, but it is certainly an important one.

We're going to use the results of what we review and the people that are doing the review are Center for Online Learning experts, so you're not going to be, your courses, or have an online courses are not going to be reviewed by someone who doesn't know anything about what they are doing. These are people that do this for a living for us. They are going to gather information to tell us where we might have some issues and problems that we need to create some learning tools around, some resources around in order to try to help our programming online come up to a standard that it should be looking at. I know that the rubric was sent out, so I'm hoping that you have seen that. If not, we can certainly make that available to you again as well. Once we have the information, ~~we are also probably going to~~, we are also taking a look through a different mechanism at what's going on in terms of courses that have never been approved to be offered online. There is a requirement and it's on the new course development sheet when you go to Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee that requires you to say this is going to be an online course. We are going to probably have to backtrack some and have some of those courses that were never approved to be online, to go back through the Undergraduate and Graduate Curriculum Committees to be given authority and permission and be recorded as being online offerings. That has multiple implications. For one, so that we can obviously have a better understanding of what's happening with our online delivery, but also because it has fiscal implications. Of course, that's online it has a different tuition structure than a course is not online. And again, we are having to get all of that into compliance. I fully expect that we will look at the spring courses now, we will look at summer over the summer, and we'll be looking into fall courses as we get closer to fall or into fall, so that we have a full year's rotation of looking at online courses. We will be asking people that we know have not had their course approved to go through that process and make sure that we have everybody being in compliance with what our requirements are for teaching courses online. Ultimately the outcome, the thing we are aimed at is are we providing the best learning experiences for students, and I don't know who can argue with that. Students that are taking courses from us in any format should be getting good experiences aimed at the same outcomes, aimed at the same assessment of their

ability to master the content and abilities of any course they are taking. And we just need to take the first steps in getting some compliance around that particular issue. So that's what Quality Matters is. We are starting the process and it is our Center for Online Learning staff who will be actually starting to do that review. And that will get us into some compliance at least with what we need to be looking at on a routine basis. The other thing that we've never done, since we started many of our courses is to go back and look at them again to do any kind of systematic review of online courses once they are developed, so we will be capturing all courses with the intent that we look to see those have been in place and approved to be in place as well. Third thing I'd like to talk about is the QEP.

QEP

We are moving forward in great bounds with the QEP – Quality Enhancement Plan for our SACS review. Right now we have several committees that are working. They represent all of you, every college is represented, as well as some areas with staff from the institution, but mostly the emphasis is on faculty who sit on the committees to both review literature and best practices around ~~writing across the curriculum, or effective writing. Erase across the curriculum because we are not dictating that.~~ And then the other group is looking at the development of writing and effective writing, what a process and plan for us might look like. The development group is going out to talk with programs, chairs and program directors for a start to see what kinds of things we already have in place. We do know there are a number of programs that have current things in place, that have expectations for students around writing, that have even perhaps assessments, possibly even use rubrics of different types. We are just trying to get a kind of any inventory of what already exists on the campus. And then we will start comparing that with some of the other kinds of activities that are in the literature and that are in the best practices of people who have looked at effective writing across the entire institution. The QEP for effective writing is very popular one for QEP's so there are lots of great examples out there of things that have been quite successful, and also in places we can learn where attempts were not as successful. We still don't know what the plan will look like. It's going to be really involved from all of our discovery and we will bring reports of that back to this group in particular as well as probably in some other forum kinds of distributions that people will stay well abreast and have the opportunity to input what that QEP ultimately looks like. ~~For our site visit, when the site visit team comes from SACS their whole purpose just about, in fact,~~ the majority of their purpose to be on campus is to look at your QEP, what it is, whether you have created a plan that could be sustained, could be supported, that has sufficient resources and the like, so ~~we will~~, they will be focusing quite a good deal on it while they are here on campus. So that means we want to make sure everybody's not only involved, but excited about it. We'll have some very good marketing, once we get that far down the road. But we don't have to have the plan in motion, so in another words, they are not coming here to say that plans already on the ground working. ~~It might be,~~ parts of it might be, but actually the QEP, they are looking at the plan itself and kind of giving you approval that they think the plan is supportable and a significance for improving student learning on the campus. And I think that's all I had. So I will entertain any questions that you might have.

June Joyner (CLASS): About the review of online courses, will that also apply to courses that have been deemed "hybrid?"

Jean Bartels (Provost): For now, we are just doing ones that are 100% online only. The Quality Matters does look at hybrids as well, those principles certainly can be used to look at courses in terms of being of the hybrid variety, but we are not looking at those to start with, just fully online, that have been approved and some probably have not been approved for delivery online fully.

June Joyner (CLASS): Follow up on that. Is there a timeline for when those might be the next in line?

Jean Bartels (Provost): We are going to do all of the courses that are being offered this spring, starting now, and I would expect that the review of those will take us a month or so. We'll be starting in the meantime summer, as summer comes along, and then we'll do fall as we get closer to fall.

June Joyner (CLASS): Can I ask more directly ~~about~~, is there a timeline to when we might be looking at hybrid courses?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Oh, hybrid, no. We haven't talked about that. We're desperate to just look at the online's and to learn from that, I think the lessons we learn from that will also be ones we can apply to the hybrid courses, but we don't have any plan at this point in time to look at hybrid. But I'm sure we'll learn some things that will be helpful.

Lucy Green (COE): I have two questions, but I won't take up too much time. The Quality Matters website and its section on applying the Quality Matters rubric, clearly says that it is intended to be a peer review process. Later it says that it is a faculty-driven peer review process. And one of the notes in the email that was sent around was that the QM review, is the reason they aren't being used, is that it would be very costly, thousands of dollars, I think was the statement, and while this may be true, if the folks are actual Quality Matters reviewers, there are models used on campuses here in Georgia. For example, at Kennesaw, they described their reviewers as faculty members with experience in designing and delivering distance ed courses. And you mentioned earlier that the reviewers are actually going to be from the COL, so I'm wondering why we're not having faculty reviewers, or if I misunderstood, because several of those COL folks, for example, got their degrees from our programs here at Georgia Southern in Instructional Technology Program.

Jean Bartels (Provost): We are not intending that this review is a peer-QM review. This is just the format we are going to use to get the first look at this. It is not to say we're not going to come back and do something more intense at a different time and it will have a different structure, this is really just to do first review. We are using that framework, but again it's not a full review, a Quality Matters review as you might expect if you are actually doing it from their perspective.

Lucy Green (COE): I have another question, if you don't mind. According to the email sent, the classes will be reviewed like you said before spring 2014, summer and the fall. If courses are changed, after this round of reviews, how would anyone know?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Again, we are trying to capture what exists right at this moment we know things will change, will be back talking to people after that. This is really to get base foundation information. I anticipate things might change. We are going to just take a snapshot of what exists at the moment we are looking at them. And from that we are hoping to get generalizations of where we have got major problems, where we might need to have additional resources, where we might need to do a different kind of training, or where we need to do touches with programs.

Lucy Green (COE): I have one more question. The Faculty Handbook is older than the Centers for Teaching and Technology, which is not described in the current handbook, but it does contain entries for this CTLS, and the Center for Online Learning, Section 302, says that participation in the Center's activities is voluntary, formative, confidential and grounded in theory in practice, but then Section 303 and 3.01 could be interpreted to give the COL control over online classes. Specifically, and this is a quote "the COL provides administration, and technical oversight for the use of various technologies used to deliver

high-quality online courses and components.” The question is what do the terms administration and oversight mean in this statement?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I'll start first by saying that you will remember that effective only this September we reorganized completely what was CTLS. We combined it with the Center for Online Learning, and the Center for Teaching and Learning, and what you see in the handbook is outdated information that will need to be revised according to the new structure, so that's my only comment. And maybe I'll add one additional comment. I did ask the staff from the Center for Online Learning to undertake the evaluation because it needed to be done and I needed to have someone to do it pretty promptly that had the time to do it, and had the expertise to do it.

June Joyner (CLASS): Is part of this structure of the review? Is there going to be a white paper or a report something compiled in one place?

Jean Bartels (Provost): We'll be collecting and analyzing the data in aggregate so that we have some idea, otherwise, there's no way we can plan what kind of things are needed, so people will be able apprised of what we discover.

June Joyner (CLASS): Will it be available on the President's website or will it be

Jean Bartels (Provost): I don't know at this moment in time.

June Joyner (CLASS): Okay.

Jean Bartels (Provost): ~~But it will~~, it's obviously going to be looked at, analyzed, and committed to a document that we can show as evidence for our work.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): I'm just wondering about communication with those who do teach online courses. They go through and they supposedly audit your course, when are the instructors going to be informed of or how are the instructors going to be informed of what they find?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Of their individual feedback?

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Right.

Jean Bartels (Provost): We certainly will be doing that. We're making sure that we share what our findings for any particular course, with that particular faculty. The notification went out to all faculty through the Deans and I assume, the chairs, the program directors, that we were conducting a review, so that was the notification that we are doing it. And then obviously we'll try to get as much feedback back to people as we possibly can to be of help to them. That's the whole purpose of this to make it better. Okay. I'm escaping now.

Devon Jensen (COE): I'm just wondering if you can maybe just explain a little bit more about the impetus behind doing the review of all online classes. When you mentioned, for instance, in your comments today at our meeting, that you're concerned about all learning on campus, and so I'm wondering ~~when~~, we actually have more face to face delivery, if there's going to be a similar review done of all face-to-face classes as well.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I would love to. My thought is that that should be happening as well. I think it's an excellent question. ~~We are~~, we have obvious obligations to document more things about online, because it's the hot thing now for people to be concerned about. But I think it does raise the question of what do we do to consistently review what is happening in face-to-face delivery. We have not tackled that issue yet, but I think it's an excellent thought to be raised, and I think it should be looked at.

Devon Jensen (COE): So just as a clarification, can you just reaffirm to me ~~what the actual~~, what was the catalyst that kind of set off this need to do a review of online classes, just so I can understand a little bit about the context.

Jean Bartels (Provost): ~~Two-fold~~, really two-fold. One is that we have an expectation by all of our creditors that we actually do do something systematic and consistently reviewing the consistency and the quality of programs that we offer by alternative means. That's online coursework. So there is a requirement that everything that we touch in our test document, for example, also looks at what that means in terms of distance learning which goes the whole gamut of student outcomes, student learning, student assessments, ~~everything that~~, every criteria in the SACS document requires that we also address anything we do by distance, so that's one of the impetus that we actually look consistently at what's happening across our programs that are offered, and courses that are offered online. We have to be able to document that we look at that routinely. The second impetus is we've never done it. So not only was it beyond time, it was kind of critical to me if you are thinking about good teaching, learning, and pedagogy, why we have not done this before kind of troubled me. So that was the second impetus. We've not done it, so things have gotten rogue sometimes. Sometimes we've got fabulous practice out there that nobody else knows about. So it was really to do both of those things. That was the impetus. But we are required, again, to be doing that. The fact that we haven't I thought was troublesome.

- 4. President's Report: (Brooks Keel):** I think my report will be rather brief today, but just let me sort of give you an update on where we are with the budget at this point in time.

Budget

As you recall, from the last meeting, I mentioned that the Governor's budget was basically approved ~~almost intact by the House~~, essentially intact by the House. Last Monday was crossover day and that's the day in which the bills from the House go to the Senate and the ones in the Senate go to the House and they mark them up over the next several days. The House budget went to the Senate; the Senate has passed out its own version of the budget. In that version of the budget, there was several reductions that go to the University System of Georgia. One was an \$8 million reduction that is to make up for the supposed cost-savings of the mergers that have happened across the USG. And there was a \$7.5 million reduction going towards out-of-state waivers. The Senate, I believe I mentioned at the last meeting, has got great concerns about the use of out-of-state waivers because that essentially translates into, in their view, a subsidy of the state of Georgia for out-of-state residents, and they have reduced the budget by \$7.5 million. Now, the legislature is scheduled to be over with on March 20th, that is Sine die Day, in which the by law they cannot go any further than 40 days. That is scheduled to be the 40th day. Reality is, we probably won't know what the budget is going to be until midnight of that particular day. That's typically what happens in the legislature. Any controversial bill and the budget sometimes is one of those is not often passed until the very last minute, and so it probably will be March 20th before we actually know what the overall bill coming out of the legislature ~~will be~~, what the budget will be. ~~That will be~~, that will determine how much money goes to the University System of Georgia and just to refresh your memory it will be the April board meeting, as now what is scheduled at the time in which the University System of Georgia and the Board of Regents will discuss the budget, so it will be the middle of April before we actually know what allocation will come to Georgia Southern. So keep your fingers crossed, and keep up to speed on what's going on, and we'll try to keep you informed as those two important dates come around: March 20th and the Board meeting in April. It should be very soon after that Board meeting we'll know what particular budget cuts we'll be faced with, what potential money will be available for raises, what potential new money will come in in the event of a tuition increase and all those answers should be forthcoming at that time. So we'll certainly keep you informed on

progress as it relates to that. That's kind of what we're dealing with at the moment. Things are getting pretty exciting in Atlanta during these next two weeks as a lot of compromise and sometimes conflict takes place, so stay tuned and we'll try to keep you informed. And Madam Provost unless you can remind me of anything else, I think ~~that's~~ that kind of brings you up-to-speed.

Gun Legislation

Oh, the House Bill 875, the gun legislation that is still up in the air at this point in time. As you know, the House passed a bill, this is the campus carry bill, if you recall, which died last year. The House passed a campus carry bill which still makes it illegal for licensed carriers to carry a concealed weapon on campus. Although, it's significantly reduces the penalty associated with being caught carrying a weapon on campus. That bill is being debated in the Senate, even as we speak. There are a lot of other bills that will be potentially attached to that which can make them more and/or less attractive for passing, depending on what they are. And I have a very good feeling that that will be another one of those bills that will probably go until midnight of the very last day of the session before we know what bill has passed, if any, and if it is passed, what the stipulations are in that bill. If you will recall from last year, the bill that was passed in the House and actually came out of the Senate, was to allow complete carry of firearms on campus, with no penalty whatsoever. That bill died in conference committee at the very last minute, ~~a quarter of midnight when it actually died,~~ actually died right at the stroke of midnight. So there's an awful lot that ~~will happen,~~ can happen between now and then. We are being told by the System office to "stand down" that there is a great deal of conversation going on behind the scenes; I know that doesn't give you a great deal of comfort and I certainly do appreciate that, but that's what we are being told and we still have a great deal of confidence that what ~~will finally,~~ the outcome will finally be something that is going to be much better than the first bill recently proposed. So I wish I had more information for you; I don't. Russell Keen is in Atlanta and will be in Atlanta full time during this next two weeks if any of you wish to call him, I know some of you have, and I really appreciate you doing that. He can give you a lot more information as it is occurring and I would encourage you to contact him if you'd like this information. We'll try to keep you informed on that as it comes along. You now know what I know, which ain't a lot. I appreciate it. Any other questions on anything?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Dr. Keel, I was just curious ~~about the fact that~~, was there any money allowed by the BOR for consolidation to put into consolidation or did they just immediately start, I mean, is the legislature just cutting immediately or not allowing the transitional period?

Brooks Keel (President): Well, now, that's a great question. To my knowledge, the System did not put any money into those universities, nor did they take any money out. The concept was that there was a savings between the merger, this is my understanding, there was a savings between the merger. That money would be used by that merged university for the benefit of its programs. There was no expectation from the Governor's office or from either House or Senate that they would reduce money from us because how would you come up with a number? I don't quite even know how they came up with the \$7.5 or the \$8 at that point in time. There's a lot of posturing going on between the House and the Senate, and between the Senate and the Board of Regents and this maybe some of that. There will also be a great deal of compromise that will take place between now and Sein die on the 20th, so I don't expect that whatever cuts that are finally made is going to be anywhere near that amount of money. But we just won't know until it actually happens, so if you want this to make a lot of sense, you are going to be disappointed, I think, at this time. All right. Thank you very much.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Robert Costomiris [CLASS], Chair.)

There were two requests for information submitted during the last cycle. One was about the [Policy Regarding Honor Cords at Graduation](#). This was sent to Velma Burden. There was another RFI about [Faculty Attendance at Graduations and Honors Day](#). Dr. Bartels answered that and the answer is available on the SharePoint website. There was a Discussion Item submitted by Senator Devon Jensen on [Communicating the 5% Budget Cutback](#) to the campus community and beyond. The SEC did not put this on the agenda because it has been discussed at every Senate meeting since the fall and has or will be discussed even more today. So we didn't think it was necessary to make a specific discussion of that item right now.

Formulation and Issuance of University Policies

Regarding the Formulation and Issuance of University Policies: Since the last Senate meeting, Maura Copeland and Dr. Keel worked more on that, sent the SEC a revised version it, which I sent out this morning. I hope you all had a chance to see it and the SEC was pleased with the latest version, although there are still, I think, some issues that I hadn't thought of that have been pointed out to me especially regarding the interim policy, and the kind of, there's really no provision that puts an end to an interim policy, no deadline by which an interim policy stops being an interim policy and is a real policy. And I don't know, Maura, do you have any comments on that? Are you available to speak on that?

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): Yes, the provision in there, we purposely didn't put a date on it. What it says is that that interim policy is only put in place if it's an emergency and we have to have a policy quickly before we can go through the whole process. Then it says the interim policy ceases to be interim, and becomes a real policy once it has been through the process that's outlined in the policy on policies.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: ~~Is there, is there, there's no,~~ there's no limit on the number of times an interim policy can be renewed? Is that correct?

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): Correct, it is in place for 6 months at a time.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Would it not be possible to put a limit on the number of renewals?

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): Well, it is expected that a real policy will be put into place, hopefully, within the first 6 months.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: right.

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): But you know, I don't know that we can reasonably say for every policy when that cutoff is going to be.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: true. Any comments on that from anyone else?

Kent Murray (CLASS): If it is an emergency, an emergency can be dealt within 6 months or a year, where we are lacking on resolving the emergency, without a review of input from others to that, I am also concerned as he is with the open dooriness of this and just one person establishing and continuing this without input from others.

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): I agree that it should be fixed within 6 months, that's why we made it 6 months, but it can be extended for an additional 6

months if something happens. You will be informed all along the way because keep in mind you're going to get those emails that say an interim policy has been issued, then a revised policy or a new policy or a permanent policy has been issued, so you'll know when that happens. So ~~if you can~~, if you see an interim policy come out and then nothing happens for a year, you could certainly be the person to bring that issue forward and put a proposed policy in place, especially if you have issues with the interim policy as it was written.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Maura, it puts the burden though on an individual to monitor the time that the policy, interim policy is actually in effect, which can be difficult.

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): Well, I mean, surely if you have an alternate suggestion I would like to hear what it is, but I'm just concerned also that if we make it so that there's a deadline and the interim policy dies, and no one's paying attention to it and nothing happens, then we have no policy.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: I see. Janice Steirn first.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Would it be possible to have the 6 months and then an extension and if the issue is not resolved and we don't have a real policy by then, the new interim must be developed at that point because if there's no real policy I mean that sets a deadline for get the real thing in or clearly this interim is not working well enough to become real, so a new interim policy must at that point be introduced.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): ~~I'd just to get a sense of, can we have an example of an interim policy and, I mean,~~ has there been an interim policy that's gone past 6 months or a year, I mean, do we have any concrete examples of interim policies?

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): No, we haven't ever had an interim policy. This is new in our policy on policies. One other thing to note to, if it's something that ends up not working after we pass it, we have a whole mechanism in there to revise it, so

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Okay, thank you Maura. Any other questions for Maura? Oh, Rob Pirro

Rob Pirro (CLASS): This is just actually more a comment in following up with what my faculty colleagues have said, but I think the concern is that we don't want to have sort of interim policies rolling over without proper faculty oversight, and I definitely think we should find a way to put a limit on the number of interim policy process on a particular issue either 6 months, a year, I think it would be worthwhile really reflecting on that in finding a limit.

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): The way I see it if an interim policy becomes visible or contentious enough that the faculty is aware of it, this body could act at any time including before or after or during an interim policy to formulate an alternative policy and then it would be up to President Keel to decide whether to accept the Senate's recommendation or not. Of course, it would have to be an academic area that you know that we are talking about, but I don't see that the Senate would have to wait until one of these things expired or went two or three times before acting.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Thank you. Anybody else? Okay, thank you very much.

University Budgets



Let me go on with the rest of the report. Just for your information, thanks to a Librarian's help, we have the University budgets for the past five years are now available on the Senate SharePoint web site. And so for all of you number buffs you can go see actually what a University budget looks like.

University Statutes

The University Statutes, are still be revised. And hopefully we will see them at the next Senate meeting.

Student Ratings of Instruction

And the committee examining student ratings of instruction which is being chaired by Rebecca Ziegler has, is in the process, I believe, of analyzing the responses from the survey, and

Rebecca Ziegler (Library): Yes.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Pardon me?

Rebecca Ziegler (Library): Yes.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Yes, thank you and will present their results to the Senate at the next meeting.

Meeting with the Provost

I wanted to say a few comments about our, the SEC's meeting with Dr. Bartels on Wednesday, last week. Just to add to what she said, and I'll skip over all the things that she's already covered. ~~I just, there were,~~ we did talk about a lot of stuff and from our perspective, you know, we were asking lots of questions about salary and class size, and I wanted to kind of just go over a few things that I jotted down during that meeting. The Provost acknowledged that summer classes help retain students and help them progress towards graduation and then there some interesting compelling data to support that. But the question of what classes should be offered rests with the colleges and departments who know best what the majors need. Okay. Which courses college deans ultimately decide to offer is then sent back to the Provost along with faculty salaries necessarily teach those classes and any other ~~teaching needs that the college might,~~ non-teaching needs the college might have, so that's how kind of the roughing out of what is possible in the summer seems to transpire. The Provost and the Vice President for Business and Finance, who is also at this meeting, then sit down, decide ~~how much money summer tuition,~~ how much of summer tuition and fees goes to the Academic Affairs part of this budget, this pie. And what remains, it doesn't go to faculty salaries, for example, and other needs of the colleges, goes back and please correct me if I'm incorrect, Rob, to the E&G Fund. Is that correct? Okay. From a faculty perspective, and the interesting thing to us was that there is really no exact formula that dictates precisely how much of summer tuition and fees goes to faculty salary and how much remains in E&G. So there's a little flexibility in this number and obviously the University seeks to maximize summer revenue and E&G fund to bolster dwindling state appropriations, but the final decision about which classes are offered is hard to make. Some classes remain small due to their nature or accreditation requirements and classes with higher enrollments must make up for what those classes don't generate in revenue. The

question of whether it might be possible to look at the whole summer picture or the summer picture more holistically and let very large classes essentially underwrite smaller ones founded on the rock of work equity. So we didn't get beyond that, but the way we ended the conversation was there's still stuff to talk about. There's ways to think about summer that perhaps we've never thought about such as and Dr. Bartels mentioned this at our previous meeting, perhaps establishing a fixed rate for summer classes and ~~we're at the SEC, we'll talk~~ about whether to bring such an issue to the Senate for discussion perhaps at our next meeting. So that was, that's from the meeting with Dr. Bartels and Vice President Whitaker.

Meeting with Dr. Keel

Now, from our meeting with Dr. Keel on Friday, I wanted to mention a few things. The cuts that ~~Dr. we~~ were imposed on Academic Affairs are going to impact instruction primarily since almost all of the Academic Affairs budget is devoted to instruction. President Keel said that he thought we would lose about 16 faculty positions in the coming year and that would unfortunately have an impact on the student: professor ratio. If the 5% cut is not imposed as it seems that it may not be, the money not currently budgeted will remain in Academic Affairs, but be redirected to areas the President thinks are important to the state and to our institution. And in areas that the President thought could benefit from more support are our Manufacturing and Engineering, Digital Media, and Logistics. And if there were any program cuts he said they would be driven by enrollment numbers. The last thing we talked about on Friday was about ~~whether we~~ where we were on the strategic plan for the University and Dr. Keel said that developing a strategic plan is on hold until the University gets through SACS accreditation. And that we can begin probably on a strategic plan probably in fall 2015. Is that correct, Dr. Keel?

Brooks Keel (President): Essentially a new strategic plan is on hold. We still have a strategic plan in place as you know, and we are now following that, if you will, in our SACS accreditation we'll be based off of that, but yes, it certainly is time for this University to have a new strategic plan and as you all know that's a very involved, by definition, it should be very involved process and we felt it was prudent not to engage in that sort of process and ask you to do all that sort of work while the SACS accreditation review was underway. So, my anticipation is as soon as we get through that we will mount a very inclusive and very comprehensive strategic planning process.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Thank you, Dr. Keel. So that concludes the SEC report. Are there any questions based on that report?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I was wondering if in your meeting with Dr. Bartels, you had talked about how summer classes, like graduate versus undergraduate summer classes that are different in a lot of characteristics, size, of course, being one?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Yes, we did talk about it. Mainly with regards to numbers, like what does it take and it's very hard to figure out what makes a class fly, for example, and graduate school numbers, ~~you know, I mean, we really, I, I~~ I am still not clear, and please other SEC members can speak and Dr. Bartels can speak to this, what makes an adequate class for graduate seminar in the summer. I don't know, ~~obviously they~~, a certain amount of income needs to be generated to pay for the faculty, but beyond that or can it run below that, I'm not absolutely sure. Anybody else? It makes it tough in the summer to have small classes. And that's why the question of is it possible to let really big classes in a sense carry the littler ones with them, was something that came up.

Olga Amarie (CLASS): I was wondering if you had a discussion about study abroad in the summer?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: We did not. Okay, so with that I'll move on to # 7. There was one motion sent up regarding BOR Policy 2.5.2. And I would like to recognize Michael Moore.

6. Motions Approved:

6.1. ["BOR Policy 2.5.2"](#) Michael Moore (COE): Thank you. And Mark I have an electronic version

Michael Moore (COE): I move that we move that President Keel contact the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia and ask for an interpretation of BOR Policy 2.5.2. President Keel would report back to the Faculty Senate at its April meeting.

Michael Moore (COE): Some of you may wonder why we appear to be so obsessed with 2.5.2. And it's because we see this as a much bigger issue, calling into question all of faculty governance, and the relevance of the Faculty Senate. The BOR Policies and Procedures set up a system of accountability and it is very clear on the intent.

Last fall, I went to the Board of Regents Office and started with the bound minutes from 1931, I pulled and followed the development of the policies and procedures in every set of minutes up to the most recent, the minutes are remarkably indexed by keyword and changes to policy and procedures are very clear. This is especially true all the way up to 1948, when policies and procedures were first created by the Board of Regents, and passed in 1950. At that time, the policies and procedures, Chancellor requested in these policies and procedures to review the minutes from every Faculty Senate in the System. Then in some of the 1993 minutes are handwritten notes by the Chancellor where he writes, and these are in the minutes; it makes it clear that Presidents must pass along to him any passed motions from their Senate that the President does not accept with written justification. These are to go to the Chancellor. It is parallel to Policy 1.2.2., which holds the Chancellor to the same responsibility. And that's been in there from the beginning. There is absolutely nothing in any of the policies and procedures about only certain bodies being able to act. I asked this of an attorney and two professional staff while I was at the Board of Regents office. He looked at me like I was crazy. It's a system of accountability and oversight. It is a process. These are procedures. This particular policy was last revised and passed in 2007. The Board of Regents found no reason to change any of the wording from the creation of the 1993 policy. Are we going to follow them or not? President Keel has refused to accept seven passed motions of this body in his time here. He has reported none of these to the Chancellor. Why hasn't he done so? He has not done so because as the Senate was told this last year only the President can act. Therefore, apparently passed motions were not actually passed. Because this is an act, and the Senate cannot act, so the President never has anything to report to the Chancellor under 2.5.2., because the Senate does not do anything. This is absurd. And runs completely counter to the accountability called for in the Board of Regents' Policies. This motion asks the President simply to contact the Chancellor for his interpretation of 2.5.2. If the Chancellor says we're not going to follow this procedure, then that tells us about accountability in governance. That happened to be the case and I were on the Senate I would find another way to spend my time. What would keep any President from thinking that their Senate is irrelevant? But I don't believe really this is the intent at all. I think the intent was for the Chancellor to be informed as to what faculty governing bodies were doing on each campus. Thank you.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Thank you. Any discussion about this matter?

Brooks Keel (President): Let me just make a comment on this, and I do fully appreciate that there's a difference of interpretation here and I appreciate that and accept that. This to me is

the same motion that was made last time and you'll get the same answer. I have contacted the Chancellor's office yet again and we've gotten the exact same answer. So if you wish to take the time to pass this motion, that's fine. It is certainly your prerogative, but you'll get the same answer from me that you got the last time. And I know it's not what you want to hear, but I can't make it sound like what you want to hear. And I apologize for that.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: I'm sorry, I missed, is there someone before Maura?

Rob Pirro (CLASS): Could you tell us briefly what the answer the Chancellor was?

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): I do think it's important as your attorney for me to let you all know what the legal advice was here. The Board of Regents is in charge of this rule, and so it really doesn't matter what I think the rule means, or even what Dr. Keel thinks the rule means. Under Georgia law the agency that is responsible for the rule is the agency that gets to interpret it. So when I called the Board of Regents and I did do that again recently. The answer that they gave me was that they don't feel that the President has vetoed anything, within the meaning of that rule, and so they don't expect a report on a veto, because they don't feel that a veto has taken place. And, you know, we can talk about what we think the rule means but at the end of the day under the law it doesn't really matter, what matters is what they think it means.

Jance Steirn (CLASS): In that case, I would like to have a definition of veto. I mean, I thought a veto was when we voted one way and then that vote was essentially deemed unimportant or didn't exist, so, and if, I mean, I have counted them, seven sounds like a good number, you know, if there have been seven, and the Board doesn't think any of those were vetoes, then I think we need a definition of what a veto is, so that we'll understand when we think there's a real veto.

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice President for Legal Affairs): The best that I got out of them on that was that whole if an act has taken place that the President has undone, they would consider that a veto. But in these cases they don't feel that anything has happened, it's just declining to follow a recommendation rather than vetoing an act.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): So let me ask, is it true then that the Chancellor's office is not made aware of any Presidents, I mean, a historical question here, when was the last time the Chancellor's office was made aware that a faculty motion wasn't accepted by the President? I mean, at some point in the past that must have been true, if Professor Moore's research shows, so when did that practice stop, do you know?

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs): I do know that the rule was made in 1952, and that the current legal counsel cannot remember an instance when the Chancellor was made aware of such a situation.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, then I am totally confused. If a motion being passed is not an act, or is not being treated as an act anytime since 1950's then what is an act?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Maura do you want to answer that?

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs): I think the only thing I can tell you is what I've said that, which is what they told me, is that the motions that are passed are recommendations to the President to do something. And if he declines to do that, the act itself never took place and there's no veto, and that's what they told me.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: President Keel, could I ask you a question? Did you speak actually to the Chancellor about his, or just get the advice from the Legal Office at the BOR?

Brooks Keel (President): No, we got the advice from the Legal Office at the BOR, which is where he would refer such questions on legal matters , on policy interpretations.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Is there anything that this body can do that then would be an act, not a recommendation? I mean, if there's no such thing as an act, then of course the Chancellor's never received any communication because an act doesn't exist.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: That would be my understanding. Maura, do you have a

Jean Bartels (Provost): Sorry, I didn't mean to snap, but this body acts on curriculum all the time. That would be an act. When you approve a program to go forward, when you approve a new course, that's an act, as one example.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Isn't that, aren't we just voting on that? I mean, I guess that I'm not sure when I'm voting when I'm voting on an act and when I'm voting on a recommendation then. ~~I don't~~, I can't distinguish.

Patrick Wheaton (CLASS): In that sense, if we vote and act on curriculum, yet we've been told the last time around this body never acts, there's a contradiction. Secondly, why would the Board of Regents Policy contain language about vetoing if we don't act. Because why would you have a veto if there's nothing to veto.

Maura Copeland (Associate Vice Chancellor of Legal Affairs): I don't think anyone in this room can answer what is an act to them, and what is not. They are telling me that they don't think that Dr. Keel has vetoed anything within the meaning of the rule. And so I don't know. What they did tell me last time was that in their view Faculty Senate is a recommending body, an advisory body, and so we asked. We asked them last time, well what is not, give us an example of a committee that does act and they said they weren't aware of one off the top of their heads, but they thought there probably were some across the System who do something, who are empowered to do something without having it just be a recommendation that then has to be approved by another layer.

Michael Moore (COE): We've never brought this motion before the Senate before, as a point of clarification. But very briefly in Policy 2.52. here's what it says, "The president shall have the right to call meetings of any council, faculty, or committee at his/her institution at any time. The president shall have the power to veto any act of any council, faculty, or committee of his/her institution but, in doing so, shall transmit to the proper officer a written statement of the reason for such veto. A copy of each veto statement shall be transmitted to the Chancellor." How can that be less clear?

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): There are many legislative bodies all over the world who have some nice rules that they choose to ignore at one point and not another, and I think this is in that category. They probably haven't repealed it because it would limit the power of the Chancellor, and some future Chancellor may wish to take advantage of it, but apparently the current Chancellor does not.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): ~~Does anything~~, does anything prevent the Senate from communicating directly with the Chancellor? I mean is there rule or legal law that would prevent the Faculty Senate from sending a communication to the Chancellor?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Does anyone know?

Pat Humphrey (COSM): There's absolutely nothing that prevents us from communicating with the Chancellor, and when I was at the USG Faculty Council last weekend, or a week ago, he said he was perfectly willing to hear from Faculty Senates.

Brooks Keel (President): Let me just mention that you do have a representative that sits on a Council of Faculty Senate's that meeting with the Chancellor regularly. This would be a great opportunity to bring something like this up.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Is there any further discussion of this motion? Any amendments to the motion? So, shall we vote on the motion? All in favor of this motion, say aye, Sorry, what do I, repeat the motion, yes, all in favor of the motion moving that President Keel contact the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia and ask for an interpretation of BOR Policy. 2.5.2., and report back to the Faculty Senate at its April meeting. All in favor, excuse me, yes sir.

Brooks Keel (President): We have had numerous discussions about this at several other Faculty Senate meetings. If you look at the information that was contained in this or in past meetings, you will see voluminous discussions on this. We contacted the Chancellor's office no less than three times about this and the answer's been the same, and as I say, if you ~~want me to~~ want to pass a motion, you'll get the same answer. I'm sorry that you don't agree with the answer, but I can't change that answer.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: But is contacting the Legal Office the same as contacting the Chancellor himself?

Brooks Keel (President): Absolutely.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: So here we are.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Could I request that when we vote on this, we have the option to decline to vote and then have the number of those who declined recorded? Abstain is what I meant. Wrong word. I meant abstain, not decline. I used the wrong word. Well, ~~really I just wanted a called~~, I just want it to be made clear that some people abstain. Yes.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: All right. Okay, the way we'll handle this is we'll take a vote, ~~ayes, nays~~, ayes, nays and abstentions. Is that all right? So all in favor, shall I read the motion yet again? Okay. All in favor of moving that President Keel contact the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia and ask for an interpretation of BOR Policy. 2.5.2., and report back to the Faculty Senate at its April meeting, say aye. Or raise your hand. Raise your hand, sorry. I get 9, can you hold it up higher please? Okay, sorry. Okay we have 11 ayes, nays, we have 9 nays, and abstentions, 9 abstentions. You got 11 abstentions. Can we see the abstentions, again please? Higher. So the ayes have it. Does that make it, a majority. So we had, as of 10 ayes, 9 nays, and 9 abstentions. So the motion is not approved. So and with that we will go to # 8, Unfinished Business. Any unfinished business?

7. Unfinished Business

Janice Steirn (CLASS): And being incredibly naïve about *Roberts Rules*, if I wanted to like make a different suggestion about the recent motion, with that be unfinished or would that be new?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: I believe it would be unfinished.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, then I am going to ask another naïve question. Is it at all possible, I'm a little uncomfortable with I'll have my people talk to your people, is it at all possible to invite the Chancellor to a meeting of our Senate?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: I can't see why not. I mean, we can extend an invitation, I'm sure. So, whether we can get him to actually come, he was here on campus a while back, and didn't, I actually, I addressed, I asked him something like this question and he was not really familiar with 2.5.2., so and that's, you know, he indicated interest in it, but we didn't, it didn't go anywhere. That's a, he was here in the fall. I believe.

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): I think Pat Humphrey said that she had the opportunity to talk to the Chancellor at the combined Faculty Senate meeting, or he was present? Oftentimes in cases like this it makes more sense to do something informally. The Senate could direct Pat at, you know, it could be an opportunity to bring this issue up to the Chancellor and then get a report back, which would be a semi-formal kind of act, but jumping, you know, directly to inviting the Chancellor to discuss, you know, how he does his job is

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: He might jump at the chance. All right any other unfinished business? Does that

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Well, this, too, may be incredibly naïve, but it seems to me that the issue that we're concerned about is not really about the definition of veto, and the definition of act, we just want some kind of assurance that when President Keel doesn't follow our advice in our advisory role, that he will tell us his reasons and give us a chance to discuss them, and I believe that in general he has done that, but I think it, we probably would like a policy statement that he would do that.

Brooks Keel (President): I believe there is something in the Faculty Senate Handbook that requires me to either say I accept or deny a motion within 30 days and provide some explanation as to why and I have done that, so I don't know if that would be considered a policy, and I'm not even sure where I have seen that, Robert, you may know.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: It is in the Handbook.

Brooks Keel (President): So there is a policy from that perspective if it happens, and just to set the record straight, my staff tells me there's only two motions/recommendations that flatly denied, and there are two that been deferred which actually were finally acted on and have passed, or the recommendation was carried out by the Provost's office, so not to split hairs, but those two motions and explanation was provided as to why.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Just a point of information. The 30-day up or down from the President, that's in the University *Statutes*. The other thing is the University *Statutes*, also says that we are the official faculty advisory board/council to the President, but it also states that unless and I want to read this carefully, "with the approval of the President, the recommendations of the Faculty Senate shall be the academic policy of the University to be implemented by the administration." To me, again, maybe I'm naïve the legislature, in general, makes an act/recommends a policy, it's up to the Governor, the President, whomever, to veto or approve that policy. I don't see how our recommendation shall become

policy with your approval is really different from a legislature enacting a law which doesn't become law until approved by the President or the Governor.

Brooks Keel (President): The difference is the legislature has the authority to pass bills and make acts, and then the Governor, in that case, would have to veto because it was an official "act" by a body that has the authority to do so. The legislature doesn't make any recommendations to the Governor that I'm aware of. They make their voices known by passing bills into law.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Any other unfinished business? Moving on then to new business # 9. Any new business? Not seeing any. Are there any announcements from the Vice Presidents? None that I see. Are there any announcements from the floor? Motion to adjourn? I'm sorry. Can't see out of the right hand corner of my eye.


8. New Business

9. Announcements: Vice Presidents

10. Announcements from the Floor

Charles Glover (SGA): This Wednesday we'll be having our dining forum. Mr. Whitaker will be in attendance as well as Mr. Jeff Yawn and other members of Eagle Dining, so I encourage you all to come.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Location?

Charles Glover (SGA): Tell your students. It will be here 6:30 p.m. Wednesday. Please tell your students they should come out and voice their opinions and come and  about it.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair, Senate Executive Committee and Senate Moderator: Any other announcements? Before I close my eyes again. So motion to adjourn? Second? All right. Thank you everybody. Have a nice evening.

11. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate Minutes
April 22, 2014
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Helen Bland, John Howard Brown, Sally Ann Brown, Robert Costomiris, John Dyer, Steven Elisha, Azell Francis (SGA), Frank Goforth, Lucy Green, Jim Harris, Greg Harwood, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, Pat Humphrey, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, Nan Lobue, Santanu Majumdar, Ed Mondor, Marla Morris, Kent Murray, Robert Pirro, Mosfequr Rahman, Marshall Ransom, Camille Rogers, Sabrina Ross, Lina Soares, Janice Steirn, Kathy Thornton, Tiffanie Townsend, Robert Vogel, Mark Welford, Patrick Wheaton, Lisa Yocco, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Tony Barilla, Jonathan Copeland, Hemchand Gossai, Mark Hanna, Li Li, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Jessica Minihan, Marc Mitchell, Aniruddha Mitra, Linda Mullen, Shahnam Navaee, Sze-man Ngai, Joe Ruhland, Mark Welford, Tim Whelan, James Woods

Administrators: Brooks Keel, Jean Bartels, Russell Keen, Charles Patterson, Teresa Thompson, Rob Whitaker

Visitors: Maura Copeland, Robert Fernekes, William Levernier, Peggy Lindsey, Ron MacKinnon, Trent Maurer, Sonya Shepherd, Fred Smith, Valentin Soloiu

- 1. Approval of the Agenda for the April 22, 2014 meeting. (*Approved as amended*)**
- 2. Approval of the March 10, 2014 Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary: (*Approved as corrected*)** Yes, should all put your finger on the mic. Thank you. I seek approval for the minutes from the last meeting, please.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): This is a trivial point, but it does make a difference in the meaning. On page 12,

Mark Welford (COSM): It's the here vs. hear. Is this where it is here vs. hear? H-e-a-r vs. h-e-r-e.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Okay, its, no that's not it, it's under University Budgets, it says thanks to a Librarian's help, with capital L, that makes it sound like this was something that came from the Senate Librarian. In fact it was from "to a Library faculty."

- 3. Librarian's Reports of March 10, 2014: Greg Harwood (CLASS) Senate Librarian: (*Approved*):**
 - a. Undergraduate Committee Report: (*Approved*)**
 - b. Graduate Committee Report: (*Approved*)**
 - c. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report: (*Approved*)**

4. Senate Elections for Librarian and Secretary:

4.1 Senate Librarian Candidates: Greg Harwood (CLASS). I'd like to nomination Devon Jensen.

Devon Jensen (COE): Yes, I accept that nomination.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Devon Jensen is approved as Senate Librarian by acclamation?

4.2 Senate Secretary Candidates: Mark Welford: Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: We have one nominee, Mark Welford. Mark Welford is approved by acclamation for Senate Secretary.

5. **President's Report (Brooks Keel):**

Budget

The legislative session did come to a close, the latter part of March, and the Board of Regents met last week to look at campus allocations. A couple of key points from the campus allocation process.

One has to do with tuition increases. The Board of Regents always will look at tuition at the April meeting, particularly at the April meeting, and they did pass a tuition increases. They gave tuition increases of 2.5% to all of the comprehensive universities and all of the state colleges and two-years, which includes Georgia Southern, so we were a portion of the 2% tuition increase which will go into effect this fall. The research universities were awarded anywhere from a 4 to as much as a 9% tuition increase, the 9% going to Georgia Tech. I believe, and Rob, you can correct me if I'm wrong, I think the University of Georgia received a 5%, 7% sorry, Georgia Regents was like 4%, 5%, tell you what folks, somewhere between 5 and 9% is what the Research Universities got. We were lumped in with all of the rest of the universities and you can perceive that as something that's good or bad, but that's just, that is the way that that came down. They did a lot of market analysis to look at tuition increases for the Research Universities, especially for Georgia Tech.

As you know, we were asked to plan for a 5% budget reduction based off of our decrease in enrollment. For this particular fiscal year, the good news is we were not handed down a 5% budget cut, in fact, the better news is that we were handed down less than a 1% budget cut. The total amount cut was \$641,484, but the thing to keep in mind is that was based off of 57-student decline over the previous year. Had we just had 57 additional students out of 20,500 we would not be looking at a budget cut, so that's \$641,000 you can add to that another roughly \$640,000 of lost tuition for those 57 students. So even though 57 students doesn't sound like a lot, it relates to about a \$1.2 million deficit in terms of money we have to spend at this university.

The other aspect of that is that, as you know, this fiscal year, that we're going into serves as the basis, the baseline for our new formula funding, moving forward so it's unfortunate that our enrollment was reduced by that amount and that our budget will be reduced by that amount that does become permanent, now at this point, and as we move into this next cycle of budgets and formula allocations it will be based off that number. So we are aggressively looking at enrollment, as you all I'm sure know. We have some very good news in terms of what the next year looks like. ~~This summer~~

~~was up compared to this~~, this spring, rather, was up compared to last spring, this summer was up compared to last summer, and although it is very early in the process, our projections for fall of '14 this coming fall semester looks very good. We are up over, I believe, 100 students, Dr. Thompson, if that is roughly correct right now, it is very early in the process. There's a lot of work to be done to maintain that, but I think that does look good for us from that perspective.

Pay Increase

You will also note that the Governor and his budget implemented funding for the University System of Georgia for a pay increase. The first pay increase we've had in some six years, I believe. The actual amount that came to Georgia Southern and to all the campuses for that matter, was slightly less than 1%, we added money to that to give a total pool for merit increases of all faculty and staff a 2%. That was a straightforward calculation of 2% increase that's the pool that each "unit" had to work with. And then the unit head, whether that's a dean or a chair, or vice president, or a director, had an opportunity to take that pool of merit increase money and divide that out among their respective employees. We were instructed from the University System to not do across the board pay increases, but rather to base all pay increases off of merit and that merit was anywhere between 0 and 4%, anything more than 4% required a special permission directly from me, anything more than 10% required direct permission from the Chancellor. I received very few requests for over 4%. There were some, but very few. I think all unit heads, if you'll let me use that term, were very careful in terms of trying to do the best job they could in giving out merit, giving out increases based off merit, with the amount of funds that they had to work with, but as you all painfully know, 2% is not a great deal. It was roughly and I'm going to look at Rob, as I say it is roughly \$2 million dollars that we had to distribute. I think that's about the total pool we had to distribute. So that's sort of a very brief overview and an update on our budget situation as we move forward. It is not as bad as we had thought, and in fact we do have a pay increase—small as it is—it is in the right direction.

Students

One thing I totally, off that topic, I do want to mention, because I've been so impressed, I'm always impressed, by students, and I'm not telling you anything that you don't know because you have the opportunity of interacting with these incredible young people every single day. But last night Provost Bartels and Dr. Thompson and myself had the rare privilege of serving as judges for the Dancing with the Stars that the students put on. And that was a fun event, but more importantly, the event was done entirely by students to raise money to be used for Eagles account, and I want to especially congratulate our new President Azell Francis of the SGA for helping put this together. It is a scholarship fund that students are raising money for. Students will then determine where these scholarships go to and it will go to students that are in financial need. I am so proud of all of our students, of course, but this I think stands out and deserves a special shout out that they would take this on themselves to raise money themselves from themselves to award to the neediest of our students, so Azell I congratulate you and all of your colleagues for taking that on. It was a very fun event, and not a big surprise to you, we've got a tremendously large number of talented students here and it was for a wonderful cause. So with that very brief overview, I'll ask if there are any questions and, anyone? Yes.

John Brown (COBA): I know the administration started to work on compression issues last year, but wasn't able to fully address those issues, is there going to be any possible progress about that this year?

Brooks Keel (President): No, not campus-wide, purely because we just don't have the resources to do it. Now, in addition to merit that the unit heads were asked to deal with, they were also given flexibility in terms of retention, compression, and equity, so they could have awarded, and might very well have awarded, a pay increase due to a compression, retention, or equity part, but they would have to use that 2% pool from which to do it. That was the only, we had hoped that we'd have enough of an increase in new money to be able to keep at that compression issue, because as you've very well indicated, we made a dent, but it's still just a dent into a very very large problem. We just didn't have the resources to do it, and that is primarily because of a decrease in enrollment, or even stable enrollment, that is our source of new money to be able to address this problem or through reallocations.

John Brown (COBA): Thank you.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I understand that enrollment is important. What I'm concerned about is it sounds like we are being expected to spiral up every single year and I think most of us realize that there's got to be a ceiling somewhere that universities can't continue enrollment up and up and up because, like what you just said, even stable enrollment, isn't considered good.

Brooks Keel (President): I guess it really depends on your perspective. To me ~~stable enrollment~~, at this point in time, stable enrollment sounds pretty darn good as opposed to even a slight reduction. And there are several complicating factors that we, and I say we, in this largest context because it's just not Georgia Southern, it's certainly not just Georgia, in fact, it's the entire country, as you well know, and Dr. Thompson can speak to this much better than I can but the whole pipeline of students that are graduating from high school, is reducing, that coupled with the fact that the numbers of students in the state of Georgia which is our biggest market, of course, that can even have the criteria that could get into Georgia Southern, is also reducing, so you have ~~fewer students~~, fewer qualified students, to be able to come in and I think that where it has been in the past we have really relied on a strong new freshman class coming in and increasing that to either maintain or increase enrollment, that's going to be increasingly more difficult as we move forward. Which I think, there are other ways, so how else do you deal with enrollment. A couple of ways: transfer students is an area for us that we are beginning to take a look at. Dr. Thompson, Dr. Bartels, have had very productive relationship conversations with Perimeter, we've had great relationship with Perimeter for a long long time. We get very good students from them. There are tremendous opportunities in a variety of areas with Perimeter, to increase our enrollment through transfers. And I think online is an opportunity for us to expand in certain areas using the BGS, the Bachelor of General Studies, as an opportunity to expand there as well. And we also are having conversations with Perimeter, and other opportunities there, too. So we are beginning to explore that. I think that is a way to at least maintain our enrollment, if not grow it, and then the last, of course, is the graduate student population. Dr. Patterson and the graduate program is looking at trying to increase graduate enrollment by 2%. That carries a cost associated with it as you well know

based off of stipends and those sorts of things that graduate students rightly so demand and need. So it's a complicated issue. Yes, there's definitely an end to this. We can't just completely keep going without any end in sight, but I think that being able to keep enrollment stable will certainly will keep us from having to deal with a reduction in budget. That's certainly one thing. Slight increases or stability I think is going to be our best course of action as we look at these other markets to try to make sure that's going to happen. But this new funding formula is going to be interesting to see how that's going to impact us. No doubt about that. And we are beginning to take a look at how it's going to happen. You know it's based off certain benchmarks that you meet of hours these students go to, that kind of has changes at least from my perspective, changes slightly in terms of how we project, how we do things, down the road. I think reallocation, if we ever going to do anything new, reallocation is certainly a way in which to go about doing that. That's everything from compression to new faculty to new staff to new programs, etc., so that's certainly something we'll have to take a look at as well. Great question and you are dead-on. I hate to use the word dead, when we are talking about that, but you are dean-on.

Devon Jensen (COE): President Keel, you mentioned in your report that the original expectation of 5% budget cut across the campus was now actualized out to basically around a 1% cut, yet at the beginning of the year, programs and departments across the campus were kind of had to deal with at the beginning of the year with a 5%, and I know that in the College of Education, and many other colleges across the campus, one of the ways that that was expressed, was through the reducing of faculty lines whether, you know, they were originally going to hire a full-professor, and those were reduced either to an associate or an assistant professor line. Now that doesn't need to necessarily be the case, yet we've already made decisions around those particular areas. I wonder if you can maybe comment on what's going to happen with the allocation of those resources and maybe how they've been shifted and how's that going to be expressed in the future.

Brooks Keel (President): Sure, and I'm going to ask the Provost to comment on that as well in a minute because I mentioned the word reallocation. That is going to be a fact of life for us there's no about that. As we think about investing in new programs, not only do we have to absorb a budget cut from the overall budget, but if we do plan to identify new money to go into new programs it has to come through reallocation process, so Dr. Bartels if you wouldn't mind commenting on that.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Unfortunately, we are not able in the new budget to restore everything that was request, that was taken off in the 5% reduction due largely to the fact that we had no new money either, so there was no opportunity to add anything back in that regard. We also had to reallocate a number of things based on priority needs in high demand areas, so, again, we had to take that into consideration in terms of what we could restore to an individual unit given the cut they requested. We are also faced with a new issue that will be very significant for all of us that is the result of the Affordable Care Act, essentially. Because there is now, and we just had a meeting on campus, yet to get more detail, **in firm???** detail, but essentially the message is that the way we think about and hire part-time faculty, and the way we think about and hire one-year contract faculty. We can no longer call them visiting faculty, by the way they are really, truly temporary faculty. Those rules have made us need to look at some of our allocations for next year in terms of taking some of the positions that will be in threat for being dismissed always, because of how they have

to be, their hours have to be counted and made, take some of those temporary lines and make them into lecturer lines. So some of the reallocation is going to involve actually moving some of the people that are long-term temporary people, if you will, into lecture lines, so again that will impact what can be restored to an individual college in terms of what they've said they could take off their budget because of the cut. So its **tight???** news all around, is the bottom line, and while we got back Academic Affairs actually got back the lion's share of the money that was taken away with the 5%, because that's where it came from, it is insufficient to go and reinstate everything that was taken out because of changes in priorities and because of other demands that are new.

Brooks Keel (President): The Affordable Care Act is really going to have a huge impact on us. This is something that it came out of left field, at least it did for me, Dr. Bartels you may speak better than I can, but it's going to be, it's a large amount of money we're going to have to deal with that we had not thought we'd have to deal with before and as you know this is not something that any of us had planned on or would certainly factor into so.

Robert Pirro (CLASS): Just continuing on with this question of this 5% cut that we were asked to plan for. I just wonder if there's some lessons learned and I have a couple of questions. First of all, originally we were told that this 5% will be taken exclusively from Academic Affairs. That was the thing we were told, I think back in September/October and I'm just wondering at the meeting where this decision was made, did anybody sort of raise their hand and say, you know, maybe if not in substance, maybe in sort of in terms of the symbolic level, maybe we shouldn't have sort of said that we're taking exclusively from Academic Affairs, because of the message it sends, and I can make an example of that. In December, at the CLASS graduation ceremony where you attended, the Provost, and the Dean of CLASS, as I recall the first thing you said when you were speaking was you asked all the faculty to stand up. And as I recall what was said to the assembled students and parents there was that we are the heart of the University. And it just struck me and I have to say I speak for myself I felt very ambivalent standing up and hearing that because of the fact that at the beginning of the semester we were told that this budget cut of 5% and if it happened it would be taken exclusively out of the hide of Academic Affairs. I just wondering did anybody at this meeting sort of raise a question and say maybe we should try to spread it out a little bit more just from the point of view of **symbol???** at the very least. Maybe this is not the right message to send to our faculty and students.

Brooks Keel (President): Well, I mean the other way to look at that, too, if the previous four years we've sent just the opposite message that the Academic Affairs is such a crucial component of the University, we aren't going to cut anything from it, whereas we are going to subject the cuts to everyone else. So I mean, it's just a matter of taking the share of the burden and trying to put the cut at the point that has the greatest influence on remedying that situation down the road. So yes, these things are discussed all the time. This decisions were not made in a vacuum nor were they made lightly.

Robert Pirro (CLASS): Can I follow that up? I'm also wondering whether anybody stood up at that meeting and said you know since this is an election year and since we have a very strong contingent of pro-GSU people at the legislature that it's not

likely that we are going to have a 5% cut, and so let's hold back before we sort of cancel searches or delay them, let's sort of maybe sort of wait and see. I mean, was that raised at all that question of whether, you know, jumping sort of to the worst case scenario at the very beginning might not have been a problem.

Brooks Keel (President): No, that's certainly is a great question, and while on one hand I would completely agree with that, we have to basically, there are a couple of things we have to work with. One is that we were told when we first, back quite some time and Rob can give me the hone me down on the date, that we must prepare for a 5% budget cut. And we were told you've got to prepare for that and you need to make real determinations as to how you are going to do that with every expectation that would take place. And not knowing at that time whether we are going to have less than 1% or 5% or what the situation was going to be and we surely had no idea what the actual cuts were going to be. Primarily because of the decrease in enrollment throughout the whole system, and whether or not the Governor was going to restore any or all of that funding to us when he just as easily could have said you're funding, USG is based off the number of students that you have, you always tell us when you have more students, you give us more money. Now you are telling us we have less students we shouldn't give you less money that doesn't add up. So we fully expected to have a 5% budget cut, and this was, Rob, roughly when did we get this first? September. So as of September we were fully expecting to have a 5% budget cut at this time. Now, the unfortunate part of this and again you know even better than I do, is that when you're talking about faculty positions you just can't arbitrarily turn those on and off on a whim, and it's not like going out and trying to hire somebody in three or four weeks, it just doesn't work that way, obviously. So for us to prepare for a 5% budget cut in September, it had to result in an timing issue of positions being cancelled that we did not have to cancel had we been able to look into a crystal ball and see well it's not a 5%, it's a 1%. So that's not a satisfactory answer, I appreciate that, but we were told you must prepare for this and we ain't joking, basically is the kind of way it was presented. Anything else? Thank you very much.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): Can you tell us when the raises this year will go into effect?

Brooks Keel (President): July 1. Yes, thank you. I'm sorry, I misquoted. July 1 for staff, August 1 for faculty. Does everybody understand? I don't want to, all right thank you.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Robert Costomiris [CLASS])

Chair): The report this month is fairly short. Our focus this month has been on really on helping to steer remaining issues from committees into port so we can conclude the academic year and check off some big items on the to do list. Things that have been in the process for the whole year. Most, I have just a couple of things to say about this. Most committees have been very busy, and the work they've done is laudable, right. I do want to say at the very end here, and it seems probably a little late in the day, but there have been some committees where attendance at committee meetings has been spotty and this has held up committee work and inconvenienced members who have arrived for those meetings expecting to have a meeting. And I know there are lots of legitimate reasons to explain ones absence, but I think everyone needs to remember that we're committed to serving on these committees. It's important that we do this work, and we show respect to our fellow committee members in our attendance. So please, this is late,

I know, but get to your committee meetings and be on time. And if you can't make that meeting you should let the chair know in advance. And if you find it impossible to attend a committee meeting because your schedule has changed or other things have come between you and that job then you should find a replacement and ask your dean to find a replacement or contact the committee chair and tell them you can no longer serve and then that will set in motion the finding of a replacement. Okay, but the committees functions depend on committee involvement, so thanks for that. I wanted to, I moved up #8, was formerly #8, the revisions to the *University Statutes* into the comments of the Executive Committee because really the Senate's role in this is simply advisory, okay. The *University Statutes* have been in effect since, the current *University Statutes* have been in effect since 2001. Last year, and please correct me Dr. Keel if I'm wrong, you established a Committee to Revise the *Statutes*. Is that correct? Okay. And basically to bring them in line with current practice. Okay, some of the things in the *Statutes* just weren't what we doing anymore, jobs have changed and things like that. That committee worked and came up with a series of recommendations to change, to revise the *Statutes*. Those revisions then came to the Senate Executive Committee who also made some suggestions for modifications to the revisions already made to the *Statutes* and then all that went back to the original revision committee to try and kind of marry the whole package together. That marriage is essentially done but like most marriages it's still kind of messy. There are some unmade things. Okay, and so the documents that we are going to show you today are what we are asking for really is your input not necessarily a, it's not really our place to vote. This ultimately is going to come to the full faculty for a vote. As soon as we get the revised *Statutes* in a completely synthesized form with all the revisions in place so that people can read them from beginning to end without wondering what's actually there. Okay, I'm going to turn on this machine here. Anyway, while this is warming up I wanted to say all of these documents are available on the [Faculty Senate](#) web page. On that nice thing that Ginger has set up which is called Current Business. Now even that got a little gnarly because things kept changing, right, or kept being clarified and so the documents themselves sometimes look like a work-in-progress, okay, but what I want to show you today and again I would like, we're really here to solicit comments so that any concerns you might have, we know about before the whole thing goes before the general faculty which we'd like to do as soon as possible. Okay, these are a copy, these are the current *Statutes*. These are what you will find in the *Faculty Handbook*, okay, and this is a copy of what was from 2001. All right, and they are there for you to see. You can find them in the [Handbook](#) is the probably the easiest spot. Okay. This is the [revised Statutes](#) and Fred are you here? Can you raise your hand? Okay, we are looking at what is currently the state of the *Statutes*. Am I correct? Like I said, marriage. Okay, you can see the changes, the kinds of changes here, words have been added, things have been deleted, this requires everyone here and every one of the faculty to read through so when we vote, we are in a position of where we know what we are voting on. There's not academic policy so much in here, as changes to job descriptions, making sure that we include things like for example senior lecturers, certificates rather in addition to degrees, you get the idea and you can see the numbers of changes and I'll just scroll through this so you can see.

Brooks Keel (President): While you are doing that let me just make a couple of comments if I can in essence of time. First I want to thank Fred Smith and the committee for doing an incredible amount of work, Herculean task of going through these *Statutes* and making these recommendations and changes to you, and I really do appreciate all the work that you've done over quite a period of time. And as the moderator has pointed out we will need to get the complete faculty across the entire

campus to vote on this and we are working through a process to do this as efficiently and effectively as possible. Probably some web based vote, thing that we ought to be able to put together so we can get this particular vote. I think that it would be of some great advantage if this body would endorse these changes. I think your colleagues across the campus would look to you to say that in general you agree with this or in general you don't agree with this and I think that's really what we are asking and Dr. Costomiris will correct me if I am wrong, I don't think we want to wordsmith this to death, because I think Fred and his committee have done a fantastic job of doing just that. But clearly we want to make sure that your questions are answered if you have, if there are issues that you see in here, before we put this out to the entire faculty for the entire faculty to vote on this. This is a cumbersome process, but this is the process that is laid out by the *Statutes* in terms of having them changed and incidentally once the entire faculty vote an approval, this has to go the Board of Regents for their approval, although I don't anticipate any problems there, but thank you again, Fred, for you and all your committee's very hard work on this.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So rather than, I guess what I'd, I'm not sure of the value of me paging through this for you because I'm assuming that you have already looked at this to some extent on your own. And the real issue then facing us is essentially to talk about this and let's hear from Senators about what issues you might have, questions, concerns about the revisions to these *Statutes*. Does, anyone got anything to add to the conversation or to begin a conversation? Not a word. Fred, thank you.

Fred Smith (LIB): I was trying to think of what actually needs some discussion if no one has any thoughts at all. Some of these updates or much of the updates were pretty just straightforward updating, descriptions for positions that didn't exist in 2001, and the SEC found some just misspellings and other things that no one could object to so we went ahead and just made those changes. I think the group was chosen because we are just have a lot of experience, everybody on the committee was someone who has served here a long, long time. And I'd like to think that we were pretty wise group, but Vice President Patterson found a pretty major error just a few days ago, so I would say keep reading it, there may be more. There were a couple of questions left from the SEC's comments back to us.

In some cases, the SEC had a recommendation and our committee agreed with the recommendation, and the President and the Provost had no comment on it, so we took that to mean that they didn't feel strongly either way in which case we just made that change. One was that the Vice President for Research and Development that position also shared the Graduate Dean duties and the SEC thought those should be separated in case sometime down the road there would be a need to have a second person or person at each job and Vice President Patterson told me while we were talking about the other foul up that he was in agreement with that, too. Let me just see what else was unresolved.

The President has addressed the matter of trying to establish the vote and I will say we were remember that time in the nineties where the full faculty had to approve something and it only happened because of some parliamentary trickery. Somebody remembered or thought of a method to get around the fact that we didn't have anything like a quorum there, so that will be something of a job to get that to happen. One issue that has some substance to it, the SEC recommended that if I remember right, Robert, at

this, is it Enrollment Management that Academic Affairs should be the lead unit and we were not on board with making that major change. But we were sympathetic to the idea that Academic Affairs needed some more representation other than just the Provost, if not that we at least wanted to be more involved and more updated about freshman requirements and what changes are made each year and the rationale for those changes. So the other recommendation we had was that a person from the Senate be appointed to the Enrollment Council. So that was one issue I thought maybe was worth discussing here.

Brooks Keel (President): Thank you, Fred, for saying that and yes, we had no issues with the suggestions that were made, and I believe the recommendation from the SEC was that the Chair of the Undergraduate Committee be the person that serves on the Enrollment Management Council and we think that's, I believe that's correct and I think that makes good sense. Although they are obviously graduate issues that factor into this, the vast majority of the issues would be undergraduate, and I think that the individual could represent this group very very well and we thought that would be a very helpful addition to the Enrollment Council.

Fred Smith (LIB): Minor correction, Dr. Keel, that was our committee's recommendation.

Brooks Keel (President): Correction noted.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair: The, what you see here is the part of the recommendations made by the SEC that then went back to Fred Smith's committee, the revision committee, and so you can see what the SEC said and how they responded, and ultimately the really the only thing one can do, one must do is look at the document and read the whole thing through so that by the time the vote at the general faculty comes you're prepared to make an informed decision. I would also encourage you, the vote has not been set, right? It might happen before the end of this term. Okay. And if it does right people are going to need to be alerted to it, and encouraged to read it and then cast a vote for or against it, or however it is set up. I'm not sure. I'm talking to Steve Burrell about that right now. Okay, but Fred, what we need to is a final document for everyone to read. Right? A completed, wholly, whole document without a lot of stuff in the margins, I'm pretty sure.

Fred Smith (LIB): I'm not sure if that's our committee or Dr. Keel's office or, but some combination we'll certainly have to have that, you know, have the document to look at complete.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Moderator: Otherwise people will be confused about what has been actually accepted.

Devon Jensen (COE): In a final document, it would be valuable if the parts that were changed or either highlighted in yellow or in red or something like that so at least we have some notice of where changes have been made to the document.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Moderator: Duly noted.

Fred Smith (LIB): If we are able to transmit this thing as it is now, you will see all of those, each little piece of the changes and when it was made and who made it. It works

pretty well on a computer, just doesn't work necessarily well on a piece of paper. I would also just list the committee members. I'm, I think a number of them are here: I see Pat Humphrey, Rob Vogel, Ron MacKinnon, Michael Moore, Constance Campbell, Caren Town, and Henry Eisenhart. And they all did a terrific job and we all worked very well together on this.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Moderator: So are there any other comments or would anyone care to discuss anything more about this matter? Yes, Pat Humphrey.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Yes, I'd like to say that the committee did a wonderful job. One thing that I would like to see in terms of a copy of this that goes to the faculty is changes should be out there in the margins, but only substantive changes. All these things where somebody changed the formatting on a character or something like that needs to get gotten rid of. The other thing that I would like to point out to everybody because this is a change to the current *Statutes of the University*. The changed *Statutes* provide for a majority of those voting to adopt a change, but the current *Statutes* which we must operate under until we approve the new *Statutes* say it must be a majority of the faculty, which means do your darndest please to get all of your faculty members in your college/unit to vote.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: And a majority of the faculty is 360,

Pat Humphrey (COSM): No, it's more like 400 and some whom must approve of it. As far as I know based on the SRI Committee we have roughly 950 faculty.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: All members with voting rights.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): There's, yes, as long as they are part of the corps of instruction .

Mark Welford (COSM): I was just wondering rather than have all the comments on the side that we have the original document made available, the changes, and then an absolutely clean document so we have three so we can see the graduation rather than, you know, trying to work through all these highlights and everything like that. Part of it is just for me, I'm colorblind, so when you put highlights on here I don't see them. It's very frustrating, some of these things get just wiped out for me.

Brooks Keel (President): If I could, could if you don't mind my suggestion, if we could get a motion for endorsement that doesn't mean you are approve or disapprove just a motion for endorsement of these, that will give us the opportunity when we send this out to faculty to let them know that this has been reviewed by the Faculty Senate, and they are endorsing these changes and are asking the faculty to please consider and vote.

John Brown (COBA): I was going to offer a motion.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay, we're going to wait until new business part of the meeting.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): That's okay. I'm short. I don't show up. Rob, can I ask a question from the first part of your report? Because you went from the first part right into the second part.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Go ahead, yes. In terms of the committees, that we serve on, is it possible to ask for a review of the committees to determine whether a Senator's presence is necessary. Because I'm on at least one committee where they haven't called a single meeting all year.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: right.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): And, you know, I'm called individually to come in and look over some stuff and that's it. And it really doesn't seem like something that our presence is needed on, unless there is something that is going to be policy or advisory or you know something like that.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: May I ask are you speaking of the Parking & Transportation Committee?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Oh, yes. That's it.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Well, I think that that is a special case. I think. Amongst committees that has different operating procedures than the other committees it seems to work not as a committee, but as review by individuals of parking violations,

Janice Steirn (CLASS): tickets.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: But, but, but objections to the citation, right?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Right, but I guess when I was asked to serve on the committee, I thought oh, these must be the people who determine which sections of parking goes where, what would be best for students, commuters, and it doesn't do any of that. So is it really necessary to have a Senator on there?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: That's a good question that I think could be asked, you know, in another, that's a good question. Maybe a request for information that we could investigate that. Why that committee exists? What the Senate's function is on that committee? It may be a vestige of a former time when there was more robust action or committee action. I don't know. It's one of those kind of ghost committees I think.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Do you know or

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: No, I don't know. We're all

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Oh, I was just wondering if anybody knew who makes the decisions about where parking is, you know,

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Are you addressing this

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Actually, I was addressing it to you, but if you didn't know and anybody else did,

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: No, I don't know. Parking is a mystery to me. I just want to find a place.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Got you. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Parking & Transportation, as I understand it, comes under the VP for Finance, maybe he could tell us something.

Rob Whitaker (VP Business & Finance): As it relates to the Faculty Senate, I'm not for sure, but I can help Dr. Costomiris do the research and get back with y'all. That function does report to the Vice President for Business and Finance. But the committee that y'all are talking about, I'm not fully vetted on that purpose.

7. Motions

7.1 "Comprehensive Review of Administrators" (*motion passed*)

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: the title is Comprehensive Review of Administrators. It's in the first paragraph in section 104.03, 03, "Change current wording in Faculty Handbook the first paragraph in section 104.03 from, "In addition to annual performance appraisals, senior administrators (vice presidents, deans, and directors) undergo in-depth performance review and evaluation every fourth year. " to the following: "In addition to annual performance appraisals, senior administrators (vice presidents, deans, and directors) undergo in-depth performance review and evaluation every fifth year. "

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Well, just a little background on this. Last year, of course, the Senate passed the Welfare Committee's review of department chairs and toward the end of the year, Robert, who was chairing the Welfare Committee last year, asked if the committee could work on a Dean review. And Dr. Bartels said, yes, but was quick to say now this is a different animal. Deans have broader responsibilities and they report to me so you'll be working closely with me on this. But anyway we, I'm not sure how many people were even aware that there was already a four-year review in the *Handbook* for the upper administration. So after we began work on it, we asked if they should all be four or all be five, and Dr. Bartels said she preferred that they all be five, so that's the reason for this change.

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Yes, move to adopt the resolution to change the wording so that the annual reviews are every five years instead of every four years.

Robert Pirro (CLASS): I **want to** just ask the Provost if you just tell us your reasoning behind this change?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I was trying to standardize the timing of the reviews because we did the chair reviews at every five years, so this would make them all consistently five years, easier to manage, easier to keep track of, also the, in every instance there is the opportunity built in to the new processes for earlier reviews to come up in the event that they were required or requested by faculty.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Thank you. Any other comments? So, the question is to change the current wording of the *Handbook* in section 104.03 from every fourth year to every fifth year. All in favor of that change say aye? Opposed? The motion passes. Now, Fred, there's a second motion that the Faculty Welfare Committee also is dealing with and I guess, Fred, I gave you the wrong advice. I think you need to read the motion first, we need a second, and then we'll talk about it.

7.2 “New Policy and Procedure Concerning Periodic Review of Deans” (*motion passed*)

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Yes, I'm learning as I go, Robert. Okay, the title would be Periodic Review of Deans. And I would like to move that this be inserted as the second paragraph in section 104.03: “Deans shall undergo a comprehensive performance review every five years. A request for an earlier review may be made if asked for by a minimum of 30% of the college's voting membership (as defined in Article 1, Section 3, of the University's *Statutes* – Corps of Instruction). In the fifth year of a dean's tenure, and shortly after the fifth annual evaluation, the Provost shall conduct the performance review.

The performance review will include examination of all responsibilities of the position of dean. The review portfolio will contain at a minimum: the dean's curriculum vitae, summary of the dean's accomplishments over the last five years, the dean's goals for the upcoming five years, the college faculty's annual evaluations (including electronic evaluations) of the dean, and the Provost's annual evaluations of the dean.

Faculty, staff, and department chairs of the college, and peer deans will be surveyed separately. A copy of the dean's review portfolio will be provided for members of the college to read prior to their participation in the survey. The Provost will also seek input from the Office of University Advancement concerning the dean's fundraising efforts.

At the conclusion of the review, the Provost will provide faculty of the college a written report summarizing the performance review. In addition to the Provost's comments, the report will describe, in general terms, faculty sentiment toward the dean's performance. The Provost will meet with interested faculty to discuss the report. A separate meeting will be similarly held for department chairs.”

Bob Cook (CEIT) Senate Parliamentarian: The portfolio says it includes the Provost's evaluation, and the evaluation of the Dean, by the Chairs, but then it says the whole package is available to faculty was that the intent? That the Provost's evaluation would be available to, if it is part of the portfolio and it says the portfolio is available to faculty then

Jean Bartels (Provost): If I understand, it would be the annual reviews of the Provost would be included in the portfolio.

Bob Cook (CEIT) Senate Parliamentarian: It says the Provost's annual evaluation of the Dean would be part of the portfolio, and then it goes on to say that the portfolio in total would be available to the faculty. So I just wanted to make, I didn't know whether that was confidential or whether, I wanted to make sure that the intent was that that would be public.

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Much of the language was adapted but taken for this motion from last year's chair review and I am pretty sure that was pretty much just adjusted slightly but the intent I believe was that the previous annual reviews from the Provost would be included for the faculty's examination. But now if that's not clear I suppose we could change it here.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: I think it's clear. I think it was a question of whether those should be made available or whether that would be a breach of some kind of privacy.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I'm happy to take them out, if you'd like.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: I think it's great, too. Any other, June you had a comment.

June Joyner (CLASS): Does the five-year period, does that begin on permanent appointment or would it include interim time, when that is applicable?

Jean Bartels (Provost): On permanent appointment.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay, so these are for permanent appointments, not interim appointments. Any other comments on this? Rob Pirro.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): So, if you have an interim Dean, would there be a review that would be transparent and available to the faculty and other stakeholders?

Jean Bartels (Provost): There are annual reviews done for interim; they could be included, I would guess in the document, but actually the timing for the document is five-years after permanent appointment.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I just want to emphasize, I think that maybe it's a little bit of a shock at how transparent it seems this process is going to be, and I think that people on the committee were committed to the idea of transparency that, you know, that faculty and other stakeholders are able to assess and understand the performance of a Dean and how that is evaluated by the Provost. So I'm very much in favor of this transparency. And one other thing I want to note is in our discussions at the committee level, this faculty survey instrument that the faculty will be filling out their view of the Dean's performance, my understanding is and Fred can correct me if I am wrong, the last question will be do you believe this Dean should be kept on, essentially yes or no. A yes or no question on whether the faculty member believes this Dean should be continued as Dean and I mean, is that right, Fred?

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Yes, the last question is very close to that.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): And if I could just go on one more thing. And I think it's important that when the Provost makes his or her report to the faculty, that we hear what the faculty think about a Dean's performance and that would be one question that we want to hear the results about. And, and my sense, I mean, having gone through some turmoil in CLASS a few years ago over a Dean's performance or evaluations of a Dean's performance, I can say that this, the fact that we also have this early, we have this option if we get 30% of the colleges' voting membership to ask and request we will get an early evaluation, that's critical and I think that that gives us a way an organized ordered way of calling attention to a case where we think that there are some problems with the Dean's leadership and they should be looked at in a systematic way.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay, thank you. If there's no further, is there further, any other comments that anyone would like to make. If there's no further comments,

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Just one more acknowledgment of course the committee worked long and hard on this. The Faculty Welfare Committee and their, all the members are to be commended. We got off to a wrong start. We, our first attempt was to establish a review committee and we after some work on that we were told by Provost Bartels that she didn't want a review committee, but anyway in addition to, as Rob mentioned, much help and collaboration and generally faculty friendly input from the Provost to put this thing into the Qualtrics to make it actually possible to administer it, an angel named Valerie Kasay in CATS, I wanted to make sure that she's acknowledged, too, because without her help it would still just be sort of sitting there.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So, thank you, Fred. The question then is the approval, the question then is on the motion regarding what is the title of this motion, is it up there? The Review of, Periodic Review of College Deans, okay all in favor of approving this motion please say aye? Those opposed? So the motion passes. Okay, thank you so much ~~for the committee~~, to the committee for all this work and to the Provost for helping it along. The, so we are now at #8 on the list, which is, sorry, Provost Bartels.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Just to assure you that this is for real, we will be conducting our first Dean's review this very summer with Dr. Bede Mitchell, who is at the five-year point.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay. So here we go. The, is that, Dr. Bartels, even if this is not in the *Handbook*, yet, can we get going on it?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Once it is approved, I really believe it should be implemented and we're at a point where we could do that and given the nature of the Deanship this one would work. It will give us an opportunity to test it as well. So I think it is important.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay. Thank you. All right we are at #9, which is truly now #8, and it is the report of the ad hoc committee on

Student Ratings of Instruction. Just let me say a couple of things and then I'll turn this over to someone from the committee. So the, last year in the Fall, actually, the SEC charged, or convened an ad hoc committee of faculty, one from each college, to review and student the current Student Rating of Instruction. And they were given this charge that you see up here on the list before you, which I will now read. We asked them to

- i. Determine the purpose of Student Ratings of Instruction (e.g., what is their role in evaluating teaching effectiveness?)
- ii. Review the effectiveness of the current instrument in meeting that purpose.
- iii. Determine how student ratings of instruction fit with other assessment measures.
- iv. Evaluate how frequently the instrument is administered.
- v. Evaluate how the instrument is administered to students (e.g., the merits of electronic versus paper submissions).
- vi. Examine how the instruments are processed after being collected.
- vii. Recommend ways the instrument and its administration might be improved.

That charge, the committee has been working on that charge for five months or so and they have report, the report came in at the beginning of April. So I would like to now recognize Nan LoBue who is representing the ad hoc committee to tell us about the report based on their executive summary. Nan, are you there?

8. Report of the AD Hoc Committee on Student Ratings of Instruction ***(Motion to accept the report passed)***

Nan LoBue (CLASS): I would like to, at this time, invite Rebecca Ziegler to distribute the hard copies of the recommendations of the committee. So while those are going around, I would also like to ask that the entire Executive Summary which I am about to read be added to the record.

“In the Fall of 2013, the Senate Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate at Georgia Southern University created an Ad Hoc Committee to conduct a comprehensive review of the Georgia Southern University Student Ratings of Instruction [SRI] instrument and its use. The Ad Hoc Committee comprised of representatives from the various units on campus.

During the Fall 2013 semester, the Committee created two surveys, one for faculty and one for department chairs, to assess faculty and administrator opinions. A total of 234 faculty members (out of an estimated 950) and 21 department chairs (out of 37) responded to the surveys. This reflects response rates of 25% and 57%, respectively, both greatly in excess of what is typical for online surveys. This response rate is likely an indicator of high levels of motivation to comment on the SRI form and its use.

The committee coded and interpreted the data. The results are included in the complete report with sample faculty and administrator comments representing the various themes the committee identified.

Research on Student Evaluations of Teaching [SETs] is extensive and reveals that SETs are typically used for two purposes: a) formatively, to improve teaching effectiveness, and b) summatively, to evaluate faculty performance as teachers.

However, these two purposes cannot always be effectively assessed with a single measure. The University System of Georgia Board of Regents [Policy Manual Section 8.3.5.1](#), paragraph 1, states, “*Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a written system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations.*” [emphasis added] Unfortunately and ironically, most SETs do not actually assess teaching effectiveness as Titus, 2008, notes. “Although the term *student evaluation of teaching* (SET) is commonly used, most researchers agree that the rating scales solicit *student opinions* (e.g., Powell 1978) and provide indications of *student satisfaction* (e.g., Abrami, d’Apollonia, and Cohen 1990).” (p. 416). Other typical problems with SETs include: students inexperience and inability to evaluate effective teaching practices. The introduction of bias through variables such as class size, subject matter, course level, meeting time, instructor race/gender, etc., the tendency of most students to spend considerably less time on academic work than what is recommended by the U.S. Department of Education and other educational organizations and the complex and problematic relationship between SETs and student grades.

Taken together, these findings reveal that most SETs do not assess what they purport to assess, do not provide reliable summative data on teaching effectiveness, and are known to be vulnerable to racism, sexism, and other forms of discriminatory bias against protected classes. To use SETs in summative ways to evaluate faculty performance would introduce such biases in to the evaluation processes themselves, which would violate both Georgia Southern University policy and state and federal law.

Additionally, using SETs may prove ineffective or even harmful in promoting teaching effectiveness if the SETs themselves are not designed with formative goals as their primary purpose. However, there is much research to suggest that SETs specifically designed to focus on student learning and to provide formative feedback as their primarily goal represent best practices in their use and can be highly effective. SETs would also more closely align with the USG [Policy Manual Section 8.3.5.1](#) and its explicit focus on the use of SETs for the improvement of teaching effectiveness. They would also better reflect the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook definition of superior teaching as “focused on student learning outcomes” (205.01).

Now, the general summary of survey results. Georgia Southern faculty survey responses indicated a high-level of frustration and anger with the current SRI form and its use. Many faculty expressed multiple concerns about lack of validity of the current measure, its vulnerability to factors that are irrelevant to teaching, its insufficient focus on student learning, and overuse and misuse by administrators in evaluating faculty teaching. Many faculty comments echoed findings from the literature reviewed in the Background section. As for the chairs, many chairs indicated dissatisfaction with the current SRI and its use in evaluating teaching, often echoing the concerns raised by faculty and the literature presented in the Background section. One clear pattern that emerged from the data was that chairs appeared to be just as frustrated with the current forms and their use as faculty and were very supportive of finding better and more appropriate ways to evaluate faculty teaching effectiveness.

Also note that because the sample size for this survey was less than one tenth of that of the faculty survey, there were significantly fewer total responses. This resulted in the identification of fewer themes for responses to each question, but many of those themes reflected sentiments expressed by a significant number of the respondents (e.g., 20-75%). These themes appear in the complete report.

Now, I'm going to read the recommendations in full rather than the summarized version.

Because of the myriad problems with the current SRI measure used by Georgia Southern University and its use, both as identified in the Background section and as identified by faculty and department chairs, the committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Faculty Welfare Committee be charged with:
 - a. composing a new SRI that incorporates best practices from the research literature and focuses on student learning, learning behaviors, and formative feedback (e.g., the Skowronek et al., 2011 measure, see Appendix); the new SRI should provide multiple opportunities for students to specify in writing how the instructor promoted student learning;
 - b. pilot testing the new SRI form in classes from every college and of various sizes and levels;
 - c. making final revisions to the new SRI measure based on the results of the pilot testing and presenting the new measure to the Faculty Senate for adoption; and
 - d. proposing methods to make the evaluation of teaching effectiveness more equitable and consistently defined, assessed, and used across the university. This would include developing guidelines for how SRIs should be used and objectively valued in annual reviews and in promotion and tenure (and pre/post tenure) decisions for all faculty.
2. That the comparison of individual faculty SRI data to other faculty members (e.g., department means) or to a specific "cut point" (e.g., 4.0) be discontinued and that the faculty handbook be amended to prohibit such practices. Such comparisons are contrary to "best practices" in the use of SRIs (University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, 2007), are not statistically valid (University of Washington, 2005), and are based upon the erroneous presupposition that the current SRI form is not vulnerable to biasing influences from variables unrelated to teaching effectiveness, including biases against protected classes.
- Further, in a university that emphasizes commitment to excellence in teaching and learning as a hiring criterion, it should be expected that the large majority of faculty are already good teachers.
3. That the use of SRI data as either the sole or majority criterion for evaluating teaching effectiveness be discontinued and that the faculty handbook be amended to prohibit such practices until such time as the Faculty Welfare Committee can develop more specific guidelines for the use of SRI data. The existing SRI forms do not assess teaching effectiveness in any meaningful way, and weighting them so heavily runs contrary to best practices in their use (University of South

Dakota, n.d.; University of Washington, 2005). BOR Policy Manual Section 8.3.5.1 states that faculty evaluations by students should be done "with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations." Additionally, the Georgia Southern University Faculty Handbook (205.01) already lists multiple other methods for assessing teaching effectiveness: "examination of course syllabi and other course materials, peer evaluations when available, critical review and dissemination of teaching products, performance of students in subsequent venues, follow-up of graduates in graduate school or in their employment".

4. That faculty members should be given an opportunity to respond to SRI results. "Faculty should have an opportunity to discuss the objectives of the course, how the teaching methods were used to meet that objective, and how circumstances in the course might have affected" SRIs (University of Washington, 2005). These responses should be permanently appended to any future reports of that SRI data.

5. That Georgia Southern University discontinue the practice of forwarding a one-page summary of the SRIs to the Provost's Office along with major reviews (e.g., promotion and tenure, post-tenure) and amend the faculty handbook to reflect this change. Such out-of-context summaries can have neither use nor purpose unless the data is being inappropriately compared to other faculty or to "cut points", both of which violate best practices for the use of SRI data (University of Wisconsin-La Crosse, 2007), and are not statistically valid (University of Washington, 2005).

6. That SRI administration match the method of delivery for the course: online courses should use online course evaluations; face-to-face courses should use face-to-face evaluations. The existing literature documents extremely low participation rates for online course evaluations in face-to-face courses which can only be ameliorated by the implementation of costly, logistically complicated, and draconian measures to coerce student compliance (the use of which would entirely negate any value of such evaluations on improving teaching effectiveness).

I would like to add a few comments. On behalf of the committee, I would like to commend Trent Maurer, for the phenomenal expertise, leadership, dedication, and integrity he demonstrated throughout this important work, especially during the compilation of the surveys and the complete report. I would also like to add that in composing the report, the committee was motivated by a strong desire to fulfill the Board of Regents mandate concerning SRIs to ensure fairness to the University faculty and students. And by promoting adherence to best practices to safeguarding the reputation of the University as a whole. Before discussion opens, I would like to further point out that the recommendations allow for the current SRI instrument to remain in place until a new one is approved. By resolution of the committee, I move the acceptance of the report on which the Executive Summary just read was based.

Lucy Green (COE): Thank you very much for this. I was really connected to this. I would like to point out that the online evaluations, the low rates of return is also true for online courses. I think those of us who teach online know that it is next to impossible to get anything over maybe a 20% return rate on those. Another concern that I have that I don't see reflected in the report, and I don't know of this can be addressed at any time,


those of us that teach in the GOML, which is the Georgia ONmyLINE consortium, students that are GOML students, but are not actually Georgia Southern students, are not allowed to fill out course evaluations and that means that in some courses we don't get a feedback from those students at all, and so that's really a cause for concern because that means it lowers the rate of response even further. And I just was not aware, I didn't know if you all were aware of that stipulation there. Because it is a concern for those of us that teach in GOML, which for example in my program the Instructional Technology Masters, is the case for every single one of our courses in both of those tracts.

Lucy Green (COE): Georgia ONmyLINE is a consortium where students from all over the state and it doesn't really matter they can take a course in any institution and then they graduate with the particular degree from whichever institution bid for that degree. So if you are a Valdosta student, but you want to get a Masters in Instructional Technology ???? you would take courses from different institutions but eventually you would graduate from Georgia Southern with that degree. However, because you are a Valdosta student, you cannot fill in a course evaluation when you take my courses.

Sabrina Ross (COE): First I want to commend the ad hoc committee. When I read the report, I was amazed at how comprehensive it was and the recommendations as well, I thought really followed from the data that was collected. My question is will the recommendation that Faculty Welfare Committee be charged with these, handling these recommendations? It seems to me that, you know, this final report was a monumental task and that carrying out the recommendations is even more of a monumental task, so the question is why is Faculty Welfare Committee charged with doing all of that work?

Trent Maurer (CHHS): The basic answer to that is what we did as you correctly identified was a monumental undertaking. Redesigning a cycle metric valued new measure even using preexisting measures will require a minimum of one year for pilot testing that's way beyond what we could do. We just didn't have time and we had to have this report due by today. Designing a new measure is not something that was within our charge either.

Sabrina Ross (COE): I meant a larger body helping out with this monumental task.

Trent Maurer (CHHS): I do. As I understand it, our committee chair, Rebecca Ziegler  had actually talked to the Faculty Welfare Committee Chair, and they had expressed an interest in if we were unable to do this, that's something they would be interested in doing and they are the appropriate campus committee to do so.

Fred Smith (LIB): Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: If you read in the *Handbook*, the duties of the Faculty Welfare Committee, I agree this sounds like a good fit, but in practical reality I don't think it is. Sabrina's point is good, I mean, the Welfare Committee has a hard time getting five people in a room at a time, and we come from all different areas. That's not to say that we couldn't do a good job of this, but I think it would be better resolved if you chose a second ad hoc group, Trent, anyone else who has some expertise in this and focus them on this one task.

Bob Cook (CEIT) Parliamentarian: We're, the body is, or the motion is to accept the report and so the recommendations would have to be separately considered possibly turned into motions, in cooperation with the Provost's office, recommendations from faculty, external studies, who knows what. So I think, I don't know what the committee's thinking was, but I think it was appropriate for them to put a plan of action in the recommendation as a starting point and then, you know, it's up to the rest of us to take it from there.

Devon Jensen (COE): Building on the conversation here about maybe who should handle the fort and direction that we take with this and the recommendations, recognizing that the extreme task that would be placed upon the Welfare Committee, would it make sense possibly to, because the background research and the direction it's been given, to hand this responsibility at this point in time over to the Office of Institutional Research who have the resources or maybe to be able to handle something like this and then those recommendations could then be put back to the Faculty Welfare Committee to make decisions about, you know, how they want to proceed.

Brooks Keel (President): If I can comment and I may ask Dr. Thompson to comment as well, I mean, that clearly the Institutional Research is an outstanding unit, but they are so busily focused on things like SACs, enrollment, IPEDS reports and a variety of other things that they're just not staffed nor do I think they really have the expertise, are you talking about Terri Flateby's Institutional Res, or Jayne Perkins-Brown.

Devon Jensen (COE) Yes, Terri Flateby's.

Brooks Keel (President): Okay, that might be something for them to think about once we get through the SACs review which is in 2015, I believe, but at this point in time I can't see that being an opportunity for them at all.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): I believe that Welfare is the appropriate place given the current *Bylaws* structure of the Faculty Senate. If they would care to have an ad hoc committee or have this be dealt with by a subcommittee of Welfare that might be something to consider. Ad hoc committees in and of the nature of them, are supposed to be special purpose, short-term lived committees. A committee of this nature given design, development, testing, refinement is probably going to have a much longer life span than a typical ad hoc committee.

Jean Bartels (Provost): It seems to me that and I think there's some, a place for several types of people to be working on this, but particularly from my perspective would require people with expertise to be able to do this correctly. And I'm not sure, I mean, I'm not denigrating that entire Faculty Welfare Committee, but there may not be sufficient expertise on that committee to undertake a really meaningful kind of activity. So it might be that the Faculty Welfare Committee could or the Faculty Senate could create a subcommittee or a group to actually work on that and be very selective about who they put on that group.

Jean Bartels (Provost): And I would just further add that it strikes me that part of that representation probably should include members of our Office of Institutional Effectiveness because they do have the assessment capabilities to be able to be of assistance there (after SACS). That sounded bad, real bad.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, first just clarification. Are we, we're discussing the recommendations, but are we voting on the recommendations or the report, which was the big thing.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: We are voting to accept the report.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): yeah, okay, in that case, well, I have one grammatical correction that I can just give to you later, but when I was reading the report, this caught my eye, too, and its performance of students in subsequent venues, and I understand how if we have a course that's like a prerequisite to another course, we could trace that back, but it would seem to me that if we actually have kept in touch with students and know where they are in subsequent venues, those are probably the students that stood out to us. And that just looking at that seemed really biased. So I think it really is important that we have people whatever the committee is, that can evaluate things like that because we're not likely to keep track of our students that like to fall off the radar.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I would just point out for what its worth that that's the language of the *Faculty Handbook*, not of this committee.

Fred Smith (LIB): I asked Nan to clarify one point that I was unclear on. I thought the recommendation was to cease using this immediately, but then I thought she also said later that this would only be after the new instrument was in place.

Nan LoBue (CLASS): The recommendations clarify that certain SRI data should not be used in certain ways. It doesn't say that the SRIs should not be administered or that it would be inappropriate for the faculty members to have access to the data or their chairs to have access to that data. It does specify that it should, that the data should not be used for certain specific purposes that we feel are contrary to best practices.

Fred Smith (LIB): One other thought on the drafting of this instrument, is it possible for an individual committee to appoint its own ad hoc committee?


Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): Any committee can form a subcommittee. In fact, the Graduate Committee split into, you know, piece that did various actions, I think, Undergrad, too. A committee is just charged with accomplishing its business, and then it's up to it.

Fred Smith (LIB): Well, wasn't really thinking of a subcommittee of the Welfare Committee, but borrowing some people with some expertise with this around campus.


Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): Again, the Senate has just voting to accept the report which means that the committee has done their work; they have made these

recommendations. But the Senate itself is not recommending the individual actions because they aren't written in the form of a motion. And so, for example, change the *Faculty Handbook*, that's not a motion because you actually have to, you know, put in what the wording is and if we are going to delete something from faculty evaluations we are probably going to have to have something to replace it. So this is a very **substantive???** issue that this is really

Azell Francis (SGA): It's, okay, can hear me now? Awesome. This is just more of a comment with regards to the composition of whatever committee is going to decide on the new SRI, just to ask whether or not student representation would actually be on that committee. Because though it is with regards to faculty, I'm quite sure that students would like to at least have some voice or some opinion on that.

Trent Maurer (CHHS): We didn't and it wasn't that it was explicitly discussed so much  as part of what the report itself reflects is that there are many issues on which students are not qualified to comment, and there are many on which they are qualified to comment, and since we were not the committee that was designing the new measure that would need to be a priority decision before determining whether it was appropriate for a student to be on that committee.

Brooks Keel (President): If I could just make maybe some further clarification on this, and maybe I'm trying to wordsmith this. First, I want to compliment the committee on, again, on their Herculean task and a tremendous amount of work that you put into this and very thoughtful way and I'm certainly not going to debate about whether the current system we have is appropriate or not that clearly is a matter for the faculty to make that determination. You are obviously experts. The only concern that I have with the recommendations, they are very well thought out, is I understand that what you recommending is that the current use of the SRI data as is collected not be used in certain ways, but there's no suggestion as to what will be used in its place. And I'm very uncomfortable with discontinuing anything whether or not we could debate there's data to support this is not very valid until there's another system that has been vetted in this particular environment to replace it, so that's, and I understand these are not recommendations at this point but anticipating that they will become recommendations, I'm rather squeamish on the issue of discontinuing anything at this point until we have something tried and true better to take its place.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I think that the committee's concern was that we don't want it to be a possibility that someone's career at Georgia Southern could be curtailed or terminated based solely on the results of the current SRI. So what we would want is that first of all, that the  be discontinued the practice which was reported by some people on the survey of people being compared and sort of given, you know, a thumbs up or a thumbs down on the basis of how they compared to a departmental average. I mean it stands to reason some people have to be at above or below average if the term average has any meaning at all. And courses are so varied that not all of the questions are equally applicable to all courses. The sample size is too small to be statistically meaningful for

small classes, in other words, we think it's a problem when someone is expected to come up to a certain mark so that's one problem. Another problem is when the result of the current SRI is the sole basis on which teaching is evaluated, well, there are other bases in existence and some of them are named in that quotation in the *Faculty Handbook*, Peer review of teaching, evaluation of teaching portfolios, etc. A third problem is when the summary of the results of the current SRI is the sole thing that goes to the upper levels of the administration, I think we think that it should be not the sole, but should be accompanied by some other measure of evaluation of teaching now. I expect that currently, and most cases, these things are taken into consideration, but I think they have been a few cases where someone was, you know, terminated or whatever solely on the basis of the results of the current SRIs and we would like for those to be able to stop as soon as possible. I think that's what our concern was.

Trent Maurer (CHHS): I'll do my best to respond to this quickly. Rebecca touched most of it. I want to be very clear about this, and I am so thankful to President Keel for bringing it up that way. We're not suggesting the form go away and we're not suggesting we don't use it. And if there's any misinterpretation about that, let me say that again. We're not suggesting the form go away, we are suggesting it be replaced later, but we are also not suggesting we don't use it for evaluating faculty teaching. We absolutely are suggesting that we do use it for evaluating faculty teaching, just not in ways that are inappropriate and out of step with best practices in higher education. That's why we are not saying it should be used in XYZ. We're saying it should not be used in way ABC. Everything else is a non-issue. What has come up is that we have seen repeated reports from both the faculty and the chairs of multiple practices that are inconsistent with the literature, in consistent with best practices that are not statistically valid that violate BOR guidelines, but these happen in haphazard pockets across campus. Until such time as we can design kind of across the board guidelines for everybody, we want to stop the practices that are problematic, that expose us to liability, and that are really inappropriate for judging faculty, especially because of some of the statistical issues we've talked about before. This isn't saying we can't use the numbers, although I would argue that the form itself makes the numbers meaningless, but I would say that we can use the numbers, just not in comparison to means, which are not statistically correct, and not in comparison to cut points, which again are not adjusted.

Lucy Green (COE): That's fine. I think some of my concerns were touched upon. In those two previous comments. It seems like what we're really asking for is that more information be provided, instead of just one thing, and so I don't necessarily see that as something that we are eliminating, but actually enriching. I do want to make a comment about 1.A., the Welfare Committee being charged with composing a new SRI. This seems that we are, that this committee would be charged with developing an instrument which institutions pay people to do that, and they pay them a lot of money, and then these instruments are later sold, and if you want an example of that we could go back to Quality Matters, which we discussed here a while back. (inaudible)

Kent Murray (CLASS): Quick point of order. We are just here to vote on acceptance of this. We can debate it later, call the question.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: [second] is it non debatable? Calling the question is non-debatable? So we just vote. So [call the question is non debatable] The question is on accepting the report from the ah hoc committee on Student Ratings of Instruction. Yes, Rebecca.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Well,

Pat Humphrey (COSM): It's not debatable.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: He's moving to close debate.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): yes.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay. The question has been put to

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I wasn't going to debate that motion, but what I did want to say is that I hope we can come out of this meeting with some kind of assurance that something's going to be happen from here. That the report won't just be filed way and forgotten. That some further action will be taken on this matter.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: ***Report accepted.***

9. Unfinished Business

10. New Business

Debbie Allen (CHHS): We had requested an RFI related to the Honor Cords being worn at Graduation. And this came about because students are wearing whatever they would like related to sororities and things like that. And it doesn't seem that it is consistent across campus. So we got a response back today on the Honor Cords for Georgia Southern. So I would just like to make a motion that students should be allowed to wear academic honors on their robes at Graduation, because the academic honors are separate, and then sorority type things.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I second this, and I agree with you because we want our students to seek honors. We're trying to raise expectations, and then to say well, yes, you earned these honor cords, you can use them as tie backs on your curtains. I mean, what are they for unless they are to be worn, you know, at Graduation. Why else would you have honor cords?

Debbie Allen (CHHS): ??? had a question and she said, we got the RFI that said that they can wear the blue/white honor cords for Georgia Southern, but like our Sigma Theta Tau and our other academic, you know, groups could not wear them.

Pat Humphrey (COSM): I'm in sympathy with the motion, but I'm wondering how, it's hard enough for the Registrar's people to try and enforce what's already a policy in

terms of graduating students shouldn't wear non-approved things without a clear list of what would be academic honor societies. These are allowed, these are not. I think its totally unworkable right now.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I know we have a fair number of honor societies, but I don't think it would be impossible to contact the advisors of the honor societies and ask what their honor, you know, for a description or a picture of their honor cords, of course, with the name of the honor society.

John Brown (COBA): In light of the kind of ad hoc nature of this amendment, and in light of Pat's statement, I think we should ask the person if we should table it for now and come back with a complete list of what included in a resolution for next Fall.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: All in favor of tabling the motion until we have a clearer list of academic honor, the acceptable, honorable, pretty things.

Teresa Thompson (Student Affairs and Enrollment Management): Robert, just to give you some information. Every student who is graduating is told they cannot wear anything but their honors cord. What they do is hide it up under their robe until they get to the stage and then it comes out. So there's no way to police that other than dragging them off stage and I don't think we want that. We did discuss it one year. But that recommendation had come from faculty years ago that just the honor cords would be worn, but it is very difficult because whatever group it is, that say, hey, why don't you promote your organization on that day, so its very very difficult to police, I'm not sure that you ever could.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: ***Motion tabled.***

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: ***Motion approved*** to extend the meeting until 6:15 p.m.

John Brown (COBA): Yes. I would like to make a motion that the Faculty Senate recommend that the full faculty consider these Statute revisions at our earliest convenience in Fall semester, and that some time be devoted at the Convocation to urging faculty to vote for however we want to vote.

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): President Keel already indicated that there was going to be a vote. What he asked for was that the Faculty Senate endorse the work of the committee. So I think, if I'm correct, that's the motion that is requested that can then be forwarded to the faculty with the completed document.

Bob Cook (Parliamentarian): The Undergraduate and the Graduate Committees, all the committees that we have when we accept the reports they are acting on behalf of the Faculty Senate. So we in essence are implicitly approving the things that they do on our behalf. So my interpretation in which I'm only advisory to the chair or the moderator, is that if we endorse the committee then basically we are saying that we think they are

going to do a good job. And then when the document is finalized the whole faculty would be voting on it and before that occurs the Faculty Senate could state another opinion. So this is just something to help move the process forward, as I see it.

John Brown (COBA): I withdraw the motion I submitted then.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So

John Brown (COBA): I wanted the motion that I made.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Is anyone willing to field the motion, Dr. Keel is looking for right now?

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): So moved.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay, what are we moving Rebecca? Besides Heaven and earth.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): We are moving that the Faculty, and correct me if I'm wrong, but I think we are moving that the Faculty Senate endorse the revisions to the *Statutes* and send it on to a vote by the entire faculty.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Is there a second for that motion? [second] Okay. Discussion? Yes.

Kent Murray (CLASS): Until we have a (inaudible)

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Okay. You want to say something Dr. Keel?

Brooks Keel (President): The document is as complete as its going to get. You've got the document, you've got all the suggested changes, I'm not sure what else we can do to make it more complete than that.

Kent Murray (CLASS): Responding. Then what we've gotten recently by email was the completed document with all the changes in there. Because I thought from some discussion there were still some things that had to be modified.

Brooks Keel (President): From what I understand, and Fred correct me if I'm wrong, the document that was submitted that you saw with all of the redline changes that is the completed, suggested changes to the document.

Kent Murray (CLASS): Okay, then I withdraw my personal objection.

Fred Smith (LIB): The only thing with any substance to it that I can think of where this isn't quite true, the President and Provost agreed the point about adding the Chair of the Undergraduate Committee to the Enrollment Management Council, but that is not actually in writing as of now. The rest of it I think though is complete.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: ***Motion passed*** to endorse the revisions to the *University Statutes* and sending them forward to the full faculty for a vote at some opportunity in the future.

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents

Jean Bartels (Provost): I would like to just announce and remind people of the General Faculty Meeting tomorrow 4:00 p.m. That's Wednesday. It will be on the third floor in the Professional Development Center of the CEIT building. And the topics will include some, sharing some very positive results of what's happening with assessment on campus, as well as giving you a new forum or an additional forum to have discussion about the QEP. So this will be an overview of what's going on with the QEP, and opportunity for input. There will be substantive good refreshments at the end of that meeting if that entices you further.

Charles Patterson (Research and Economic Development): I'd just like to take this opportunity to thank the faculty, department chairs, and deans that contributed to the Research Symposium that was held last week in the Nessmith-Lane Conference Center. We had over 300 student and faculty participants. Many universities from outside the state coming to Georgia Southern to engage in discussion about research and that we had 86 oral presentations and over 250 posters that were presented by our students, so a great success, and I look forward to starting to plan the next one almost immediately. Thank you again for all of your contributions.

12. Announcements from the Floor

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Perhaps the most important is to announce Bob Cook's retirement. Bob Cook has been Parliamentarian ever since I've been around the Senate, which isn't that long, but I know he's served in this capacity for a long time, and Bob is retiring come May. And I'm going to miss him at the last Senate meeting believe me. But I do have his email address. So anyway I would like us all to thank Bob for all of his volunteer, hard work over the years as our Parliamentarian. Good luck in Chattanooga.

I have had, a lot of people are retiring and that means things are opening up. The University Club officers, Clara Krug and Bruce McLean are retiring and they are trying to find people to replace them, so please, they asked me to please announce that and if anyone would consider nominating, self-nominating or nominating someone else, that would be, they would appreciate that very much. Okay. Graduation is coming up and I know that for some people that's, they want to find something more to do than sitting in a chair in the hot sun, and there was an email that came out a little while ago about, suggesting various ways faculty could participate in Graduation without just kind of being a prop on the field, and so I encourage you to look at that and think about volunteering your energy to do something, if you don't just want to sit still.

And finally, the AAUP reception for our colleagues who have just received tenure and promotion is Thursday, the 24th at 4:00 p.m. at the City Campus downtown Statesboro

on East Main Street. You are all invited to come and **met** our colleagues who have received these promotions and tenure, so, and if you want to come its probably not a bad idea to contact Tony Barilla or Pat Novotny, who are the hosts for that event. So with that, yes, go ahead, Debbie.

Debbie Allen (CHHS): We had talked in the Senate Executive Committee about Ginger. Ginger. Ginger, doing, passing the hat today.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Yes, thank you. Keep going.

Debbie Allen (CHHS): We had expressed the desire to pass the hat around to collect money to give to Ginger because she works so hard for us on the Faculty Senate. And so I just wanted to remind you of that that we had talked about that.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: So, that should needs to happen and Tony Barilla I think is the champion of the hat, so find him

Debbie Allen (CHHS): But I would be more than willing to take it on his behalf today, if anyone wanted to give something.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Thank you, Debbie. Thank you for reminding me of that.

June Joyner (CLASS): Can you tell us approximately when the Senate Election results will be announced or available to people so they'll will know what's on their plate for next year?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: In a simple answer, no. I don't know yet. I haven't, those results have not been reported to me yet but as soon, but they need, those are important for us because as I transition off the Pat she's and the Senate Executive Committee need to kind of make sure that the new Senators fill the roles of people rotating off the Senate. So its going to happen, its got to happen very soon, otherwise we'll all be unavailable to do that.

June Joyner (CLASS): Do you think it will be before Graduation? Or will it be later in the summer?

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Probably after Graduation. But I don't know.

Greg Harwood (CLASS): It should be before.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: Should be before? Okay. Thank you Greg. Should be before, notice he said, it should. Okay.

Greg Harwood (Librarian): I think it depends on the college. They each have their own timetables. I think one college has reported their results already, and I think the others should be in before the end of the semester.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS): SEC Chair and Senate Moderator: All right. So is there a motion to adjourn? Okay. Thank you very much everybody.

13. Adjournment

The next Senate meeting is June 4, 2014, in the Nessmith-Lane Ballroom.

Faculty Senate Minutes
June 4, 2014
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Nessmith-Lane Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Deborah Allen, Tony Barilla, John Howard Brown, Robert Costomiris, Steven Elisha, Frank Goforth, Mark Hanna, Greg Harwood, Pat Humphrey, Nan LoBue, (Fred Smith for Jessica Minihan), Ed Mondor, Kent Murray, Sabrina Ross, Joe Ruhland, Susan Smith, Lina Soares, Erroll Spence (SGA), Janice Steirn, Mark Welford, Patrick Wheaton, James Woods, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Olga Amarie, John Dyer, Lucy Green, Jim Harris, Mary Hazeldine, Helena Hernandez, Devon Jensen, June Joyner, Li Li, Hsiu-Lien Lu, Karen McCurdy, Marc Mitchell, Aniruddha Mitra, Marla Morris, Shanam Navaee, Sze-man Ngai, Robert Pirro, Mosfeur Rahman, Marshall Ransom, Camille Rogers, ~~Sabrina Ross~~, Joe Ruhland, Kathy Thornton, Tiffanie Townsend, Robert Vogel, Tim Whelan, Lisa Yocco

Administrators: Jean Bartels, Mohammad Davoud, Greg Evans, Teresa Thompson, Robert Whitaker

Visitors: Lisa Abbott, Chris Caplinger, Diana Cone, Chris Couch, Larisa Elisha, Bob Fernekes, Coco Roberts, Ashley Morris, Tammy Robbins, Lisa Smith, Valentin Soloiu

1. Approval of the Agenda for the June 4, 2014 meeting. Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator): I'll give my report if we have enough elected members. So what we can at least hear from Dr. Welford about the minutes.

2. Approval of the April 22, 2014 Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary: I'd like to get the minutes accepted for April, but with some corrections and starting with paragraph, no page 21, paragraph, second sentence: It currently reads, "Redesigning a cycle metric valued new measure" should read "Redesigning a psychometrically validated new measure", page 24, currently reads, "that would need to be a priority decision" should read "that would need to be an a priori decision", and page 25, currently reads, "in consistent" separate, should read "inconsistent" one word. Thank you.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) SEC Chair and Senate Moderator): So with that any other revisions or corrections to the minutes? Yes, Rebecca

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Page 24, I'd rather you not make sound so dumb. Wonder if you could revise it to read, last paragraph, "so what we want is that first of all, the practice of

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): "So what we want is that first of all, the practice be discontinued," which was reported and then on as it is.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS SEC Chair and Senate Moderator): So noted.

There are two people I'd like to recognize who are here today for their service to this body. First is Ginger Malphrus, who has helped me and everyone in here who's needed her help all year long. And I express my gratitude for her help.

The second person who is here seated next to Ginger is Clara Krug. And Clara Krug is retiring this year has been a Senator for many many years. She was a Senator for eight terms and has, and Senate Moderator for two terms and I think everyone who knows Clara and has served on the Senate or maybe just read the Senate minutes recognizes her as a tireless questioner, a person who reads the minutes and corrects them mercilessly and basically has stood up for faculty interests for all the years that she has been here. So I think it would be suiting that we recognize Clara's devotion to this body over the years and acknowledge her here today. So, Clara, could you stand? All right, Jean. I think we can at least listen to the Provost's Report. Okay. Thank you.

3. Provost's Report: (Jean Bartels): Would you mind if I sat actually just because you can't see me or is this okay? If you're over there you can't see me. (inaudible) Yeah, now I want to talk as if I have the whole meeting, so I'm just really excited about that. Oh, okay, I guess there's one more report. I extend greetings from the President. He is at a Board of Regents called meeting for Presidents today, so he was not able to be here. So in lieu of that I'm going to report and I'll hit at one or two things that he would have probably talked to you about if he had been here as well.

SACSCOC

I'd like to start with an update on the SACSCOC and this is how we have to talk about it now. It's no longer just "SACS" it's "SACSCOC," which is the Commission on Colleges, and they are very particular about everything appearing with that language and anything that you say, so at any rate I'd like to talk about where we are with the narrative self-study. Remind you again of kind of what the process is and where we are with that process. We are currently doing our final review of the narrative standards before we send it off to an external reader to, a set of readers, actually, for comment. We chose to do that to make sure that somebody who is very expert at going on visits and reading documents could see if we had any areas that we needed to address before we sent them off for our actual off-site review. The way the process works again, just to remind you, the off-site review occurs with a group of people

who look at the narrative study. That report, the narrative self-study is due to them by September 15th. They have a few months to read the report, make comment on it, and then will send back to us their review and give us a time somewhere between November and January to actually clarify anything that they had questions about or address any issues that they discovered as those off-site reviewer reviewed. That is a different group of people from the group who actually come to campus. The campus visit we are going to have is going to take place from March 30-April 2 and the primary focus for the individuals that come on the site visit is to actually deal with and look at the efficacy and the support behind the QEP. So their focus is almost entirely on the QEP while they are here. There are several federal standards that they have to review in person while they are here, but for the most part, they will only be looking at things that the external review committee for the narrative wants looked at and some of those federal standards address the time spent on the QEP. So that's kind of where we are with the process. And so far I think the document's looking pretty good and we're finding that we need to be able to talk about the things we do here. The QEP is a separate report. That will be due in, I believe its due in January, too, somewhere around January, to the actual SACSCOC group ~~for review~~ for the first review. We have had a collection of meetings with faculty, staff, chairs, to talk about where we are in the process. As you remember the entire QEP process was done by a very large group of faculty and staff and others who were divided into different subgroups. One is a group that did the literature review to support the need for or what we going on in terms of best practice with the QEP area we chose. And then the other group was charged with starting to develop the outcomes and start to talk to others about what we would ~~(supposed to stay on here, okay)~~ so those groups have been working and have been having lots of very productive meetings. I think those of you that have attended had some very good input from faculty and students and the staff, so that's moving along. The first writing of the report which is largely going to focus on the goals which everybody has seen and the literature review and kind of setting up the document, is taking place this summer, and we actually solicited three individuals that are on faculty who are writing that report this summer. That'll come back to everyone here this group as well as to additional forums first thing in the fall. So be prepared for that. We're still looking at what kind of strategies to implement. I would like to dispel the rumor that everybody's going to have to do writing no matter what in their classes and that really is not how you develop these. We are really looking at the strategic things we could do to make an impact. And that will look very different probably for different disciplines and programs, so to dispel the thought that everybody's going to forced into doing something-That's really not going to happen, but generally the consensus is very positive about the fact that doing something about writing for students is going to be a real healthy activity. Part of the QEP will also identify places where we can give assistance to faculty. What kinds of faculty development might we need? Most all of us were not trained as writers. So we think there might be some of that faculty

development that should be done as well as looking at what kinds of innovative strategies are people using across the country and beyond in terms of doing and helping writing to be improved, so lots of exciting work left have to be done on that; its moving along very nicely and we're very pleased with the breadth of participation that's occurred.

Merit Raises

I'll say a couple of words about merit raises. We were able to, as you know, this year, because the Board of Regents, the legislature, actually, allocated some money to the Board of Regents for dispensing in terms of creating merit raises for faculty and staff. The legislature gave one percent of the budget that, an equivalent of one percent to the Board of Regents to dispense, they allocated then to the institutions. Georgia Southern received .75 percent of money to distribute. Internally we looked at the pool of money that we were able to kind of gear up and raised our pool to 2%, so we actually dispensed that very small amount of money out to the colleges and to the units to work on in terms of identifying merit raises. The requirement by the legislature and by the Board of Regents was they had to be merit based so we really couldn't do an across the board amount of money to people. Additional compression monies, so what we had was the 2% that we were able to do at least a little and I appreciate that that was what is was -- a little.

Chancellor

The Chancellor did have his annual visit to us. He was here for a Governor's Initiative looking a high demand careers. The Governor's having had a series of regional meetings and he's now going to be focusing on additional meetings looking at high demand careers and what the needs are of the economic engines from the areas of business and management, mostly, in terms of that. But at any rate we had one of those regional meetings here on campus and the Governor and some of his staff were here for that meeting so they made the decision to have Georgia Southern annual visit by the Chancellor be in conjunction with that, so we did have the opportunity to talk with him a little bit. We spoke with him pretty extensively about the new sectoring of institutions. He's now created sectors of institutions with the intent that the institutions would stay in there sector/mission areas and Georgia Southern is in the sector now that is being called "Comprehensive" and it's with Kennesaw, with Valdosta, and with West Georgia. So we were curious as to when we would start to see some idea of how a comprehensive might be treated because what's been happening as you look at budget, and as you look at many decisions that are made, there are certain decisions that are made for the research intensive institutions which are UGA, Georgia Tech, Georgia Regents University, and Georgia State, and decisions are made there in terms of tuition increases and they get a certain amount and its different than what the rest of us get. And so far the rest of us including the comprehensive all are at that same level, so we were curious as to

whether any conversation had been happening or thoughts have been happening about **differentiating???**, pulling out the comprehensives to try to meet our needs a little bit differently than the rest of the state colleges and state universities. So the answer to that was that they knew, so, but we at least raised the discussion. I know that there was also a time for the Chancellor to meet with students. He really enjoyed that time, and they had a very good dialogue. He also met with the Senate Executive Committee and Robert might have a few things to say about what the Executive Committee had a chance to talk to him during his annual visit here and that happened on May 12th, and it was a good visit. He had very positive things to say about Georgia Southern.

University Home Page

One thing that's new that is coming up that I wanted to alert you to and you will hear more about this probably in the next few weeks as a drafts come up for your input and review, the University is moving to a new University Home Page on its web site. It is pretty dramatically different, but it's following the kinds of web sites now that are being created for universities that are externally focused. By that I mean, they are designed so that they capture the needs of people who come in to visit, and we have hundreds of thousands of visits to our web site by external people all the time, so the web site will have a very different look. For internal folks, that will be you and me and staff, as well as students to some degree, but mostly we'll be looking at going into [MyGeorgiaSouthern](#), the link from MyGeorgiaSouthern to find most of the information that we need to get to as internal people. They are redesigning that area that web site also so that it will be a little more friendly, but that's the look you are going to see. There is a quick links drop down that also is, that has the faculty and staff links associated with it. You'll see as you look at that new web site how that all plays out, but they are intending that the new web site will launch in late July. And prior to that time, they actually, the designers for the new web site, were composed of faculty, staff, students, a lot of external people, a lot of alumni, those kinds of individuals who gave input in terms of what they could find, what they liked, and what they didn't like, so that's really how the initial look got created. But they would like now to have other people look at the web site and give input and, as I understand it, they are going to put out the link to the draft template for faculty and staff to take a look at and give feedback about as well, so be looking for that. And, again, the go live date is right now going to be late July. Nothing underneath the front-page changes, so everything that is associated with colleges and with academic side and other things underneath the web page and linked from the web page are not, they've already been updated and they are fine. They are not going to be changed, so you won't see anything different there. It's really just purely the front page.

Fifth-year Reviews

We have or almost have completed the implementation of the Fifth-Year Reviews for Chairs and Deans. We had two chairs who were at fifth-year review state, and both of those reviews were done. The process worked very smoothly and I think were very satisfied with their ability to give input on those reviews. We are in process now of moving to do the one Dean review and are getting ready to launch the survey that will go out as part of that fifth-year review process. But I wanted to just report that the process that's been created and that you all approved really is working very well and I think it's very beneficial for that level of administrator.

Service

Next year we are hoping that the focus will turn the picture, or will get, will turn the focus to getting a clearer picture of the role of service and the way that that plays out today may be a real good example of why I think that's important discussion to have. How it plays out in your view is how it plays out in promotion and tenure decisions and actually just how we think about service on the campus and how we reward that service. So the Faculty Welfare Committee has already talked with me about having some conversation about that and I am very much looking forward to that.

Assessment

We are also going to be looking at how do we do something to recognize what is happening with assessment as a routine part of annual assessments of faculty teaching and as it plays out in terms of how people that do above and beyond their general assessment, of course, is how they work towards program assessment and how that gets rewarded as well, so I really think its time that we take a look at that and make sure that we are giving acknowledgement to people that are really doing that very significant work for our institution, for our programs, and that it is recognized and it is treated appropriately, so that's kind of the next year focus as far as I'm concerned.

Moderator

I have one last thing that I'd like to do and that is to recognize your outgoing Moderator. This is an interesting year because normally what we, what has been the norm, over time, is that we try to recognize the outgoing Moderator of the Faculty Senate by giving them a wooden gavel plaque. And Robert requested that that was not something he could potentially see as a real attribute to his office wall, so he asked that we would donate the amount of money that would have been spent to do that plaque, which is about a hundred dollars, to the Tina Schneider Scholarship fund, so we have contributed a hundred dollars to that scholarship fund in recognition of Robert's dedicated service as Moderator of the Senate this past year. I'd like to recognize him, however, with a nice little pretty thing that he can do

whatever he'd like with including taking it out and using it for something else I'm pretty sure, but it says "In Recognition of Dr. Robert Costomiris for dedicated service to Georgia Southern University Moderator of the Faculty Senate from 2013-2014."

- 4. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Robert Costomiris [CLASS], Chair.)** Thank you very much Dr. Bartels and thank you for donating to our scholarship which needs all the help it can get. So the, and now I don't have a gavel to figure out what to do with. I've got my Dad's gavel. Anyway, good afternoon, I just have a short report from the Senate Executive Committee, but first I need to make a quick announcement. I'd like to introduce Erroll Spence here who is taking over as the SGA representative on the Senate. He'll be serving next year throughout the year. Yes sir.

Kent Murray (CLASS): A question I'd to address to Dr. Bartels. We talk about all these changes. President Keel had set up this Facilities Planning Committee about a year ago. Have they been meeting? What has come out of this group? Do they report to anyone? I know that Communication Arts had that problem that we got crunched out of our old building; we've got this new building, but I think we now have to park down by Hanner Gym. Is that part of the Facilities Planning?

Dr. Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): Actually, interesting that you bring this up because we just looked at the fact that the Space Utilization Committee and it had another title, seemed to have wandered off at some point. I think got distracted by some task force activity that was being done for a while. And we are reconstituting that for the very purpose of, we have, things are happening on the campus now with space that I think are very significant. Parking might be one of those, I'm not sure that that's going to necessarily be part of the, that this committee would be the discussion point for that, but we are having places vacated and, you know, before we get into squatter's rights, I have found at first hints of activity we think we need to be much more strategic about how we use space and how we plan for it. So that committee actually just convened today and has started to talk about a couple of requests that have come forward and there is actually a process for requests coming forward for space to be looked at and this one happens to be around the Communication Arts vacating some space that was part of the filming area, so that that was the initial one that we talked about, but

Kent Murray (CLASS) Carroll Bldg.

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): What I tell you is that to this point to my knowledge hasn't been active for bit, but it is coming back into force just for that reason. The other thing that is happening with that and one of the reasons is significant for it to come back is that we've had a culture of building ownership that we really probably can't entertain much longer, if at all, because we do have such space needs and there are programs, there are growing programs that really need additional space and to just say that somebody owns a whole space and nobody else can use it is probably not the best use of our resources. So this committee will start to look at some of that activity as well.

Kent Murray (CLASS): Along those same lines I think we've got some new building coming online for ROTC and we haven't heard any projections as the use of this new 100 acres of land.

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): And I have nothing to tell you further about the acres of land that to my knowledge there haven't been any formal plans that have been made. Mr. Whitaker might be able to speak to that a little bit more. But to my knowledge there isn't anything that is being planned for it right now. We have, we were in the most recent legislative session and through the Board of Regents budget for buildings, were given the resources to start in and to build a Health Center for the students. And that will be, you will be seeing very shortly the buildings, actually across from this facility, that were Plant was over there, that were Plant buildings, those will be removed so they can start construction on that and we did receive the money now to plan and move forward with construction of the Military Science building, too, and that will be built in the spot, you know where the little, what is it, it's a little, it's a parking lot, but its near the Wildlife Center, its across, there's a little building that's

Kent Murray (CLASS): Where theater shop used to be.

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): By the roundabout, yes, exactly, so that I can tell you those projects have been approved, and that's all we've got. Rob, did you want to say anything about any other space?

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business and Finance): We have actually conducted on the acreage across the Bypass, internal master plan, that kind of lays it out. Academic, Research, Housing, Green Space, its kind of a document kind of gives us an idea, a plan where we go in the future. It's very preliminary. It didn't involve a lot of outside constituents that we would want to do when we really get into a more formal planning process. It was just to try to look at the land and say what could we do if we

had money? I mean, that's the big question is to start building across that land we've got to get, you know, significant numbers of funding of new buildings so we've just got, like I said, a very simple master plan of that land.

Kent Murray (CLASS): When you say, we, is this part of this Space Utilization Committee or is this just the administration, planning without the Space Utilization input?

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business and Finance): That was done by the Division of Facilities Services, and their staff. Space Utilization Committee, I am not as familiar with that. I have learned since we met today what the Space Allocation and Modification Committee does. And that group, like I said, we, that's the first time that group's met since I've been here for 13 months to discuss changes of people moving in and out of space and what to do with the balance of space. So that's how that came about.

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): If I could just add something to the Space Allocation Committee, the one that met today, and this is the one that is being reconstituted, we're also looking at the membership of that to assure that we have Faculty Senate representation on it, we've got student representation on it, as well, so as it comes back into function and it will be I think a much better group to make recommendations.

Kent Murray (CLASS): But, again, the question is will we get any reports, and feedback at any level from them?

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): Well, obviously you will because you will have representation on it, so certainly. It will also involve a process for how request is made for space that is needed and space that might be available so there will, that committee will have some opportunity to hear from people who have ideas.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair: Are there other questions for Provost Bartels? Fred Smith

Fred Smith (LIB): Dr. Bartels, could you tell us where we are with the recruitment of the QEP Director?

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): We are concluding the open call for nominations, so we're just about to have that committee start to look at candidates and make an offer, bring people in and interview them and then move forward, but the search just closed.

Mark Hanna (COBA): Provost Bartels, is there an update you can give us with regard to summer school enrollments? How that impacts the budget next year?

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): Well, the good news is the summer school enrollments as of this morning were up, I think, did I see 200 students from last year, so student credit hours are up somewhat as well. It's still not as robust as we would have liked but indications for that would be that we should be able to have a full complement of resources going back to programs and again we do that based on semester credit hours earned, in terms of incentive money. It has no impact on the FY 15 budget, because remember that the summer budget is its own budget. So what happens with the resources we have is that they get used internally to credit hours that were, but the good news was, is that the student numbers were up in the summer about 200 as of today.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair: Yes, Janice.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Something you had mentioned in your report was that we need to stop thinking about ownership of the space. Does that mean that at some point a department may get a call and say oh, we need this part of your building, and next year you won't have it? It's a little unsettling to hear something like that.

Jean Bartels (Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs): I don't have, to my knowledge no one is going to come and tell any of the departments they have to move because we want their space. What we are saying is that to covet it and when it is available is not what we're probably going to be able to do anymore. So no one is going to, there's no conversation any place about people coming in and relocating people. This is really to, my point was that we've had a history oftentimes of saying this is the Nursing Building, so nobody can come in here because this is all ours. Well, that may not always be true if there is space available and there's a need. We have to share classrooms, for example, and that kind of thing so that's really what my intent was with my comment. Not that we're setting up some kind of a cut/phenomena. That's not it at all. It's just that we have to be more realistic about what space that is available and when there is a need and how we share that.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair: Tony Barilla.

Tony Barilla (COBA): If I could, I'd like to make a suggestion. And this concerns summer pay, which, as you know, comes up every year, somebody has to complain about it.

Jean Bartels (Provost): Really?

Tony Barilla (COBA): Yeah, amazing isn't it.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I had not noticed that.

Tony Barilla (COBA): I'm not complaining, but I have heard other faculty sort of be in a situation where they had a class go, then all of a sudden, they lost enrollment and then after the class went, their pay was adjusted to reflect the new enrollment in their class. Can you possibly connect with the Deans and the Chairs to maybe put out a piece of information in the future that says that your rate of pay will not be finalized until the first week of class is completed or something like that, so that you can avoid this in the future.

Jean Bartels (Provost): We really tried this year to be better with that and make sure people knew what was happening, to make sure that those messages were very clear and that it wasn't just a capricious decision made about that. I think we made some progress. We're hampered a little bit by PPGRA which is the system ??? with ADP that, I guess, it's associated with ADP directly, to be able to actually do it so sometimes I think that system that's gotten in the way of the communication, but certainly we'll continue to try to make sure that that's very clear. I've been encouraging Deans, we've had a lot of discussion about how you make rational and fair decisions also. So we'll continue to pursue.

Tony Barilla (COBA): Because as anybody knows information's a great thing and, you know, as any lawyer or law economist or contract economist will tell you that, you know, if it's not written down, it means it can be discussed. And so that's why I was just wondering if we could maybe write down some of those things and end the discussion, so to speak.

Jean Bartels (Provost): (inaudible)

Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair: Any more questions? Okay, I jumped the gun there earlier. Let me reintroduce Erroll Spence, the new SGA Rep. He will be serving next year. So welcome. I'd like to give you, to speak on a few things the SEC did this past month. First, there was one request for information that I'd like to just go over briefly. It's posted on the SharePoint site. But I wanted to, because this has something to do with what the Chancellor said. I'd like to just go over it for a second. There was a request for information about [Parliamentary Procedure](#) at the March 19, 2014 meeting. And it was submitted by Richard Flynn, who pointed out that I had made an error in the tabulation of votes regarding the motion concerning Board Policy 2.5.2. And according to the *Robert's Rules of Order*. I had indeed made a mistake in consultation with Bob Cook about how to tabulate those votes. So his question what can be done about this miss-tabulation. And the answer that we gave was this. We voted. We tabulated. We

tallied them wrong and nobody said anything, so the vote stands. Okay. Now the only way to really deal with this issue if we want is to re-vote the motion, somebody would have to introduce the motion. We'd have to re-vote the motion. However, okay, this issue is also already on the radar of the Chancellor. When the SEC met with the Chancellor on May 12th, we talked about it. He said that Houston Davis, the Associate, I'm not quite sure of his title, Associate Vice Chancellor or Vice Chancellor of Administrative Affairs [correct title: Executive Vice Chancellor & Chief Academic Officer] is looking into this issue and he's, he will eventually, as, in a glacial way these things occur, come up with some response. Okay, so the, in some ways the motion's intent is already being acted upon, at least in terms of asking the Chancellor to look into the matter. The difference is that the President is not asking him, we asked him. But he is aware of our question and seems to be at least having one of his important assistants looking into it. So

Pat Humphrey (COSM): Looking even deeper in *Robert's Rules* on this particular issue, I uncovered something that we're going to have to deal with, which I can't believe it never has come up before, and that is the fact that our *Bylaws* according to *Robert's Rules* should state what's required to pass a motion. Is it a majority of the votes cast, or is it an aye from a majority of those present. In this particular case, it would have been a majority of the votes cast, yes the motion should have passed. If it was a majority of those present, the motion would not have passed. So that's something that we need to think about and pass a motion on in terms of which way we want to go early next Fall. So be looking forward to that, anybody who is continuing as a Senator.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS), Chair: Thank you, Pat. And, by the way, with regard to that we will also be needing a new Senate Parliamentarian. So keep your eyes out for that person. A couple of things that came up in the meeting with the Chancellor that you may already be familiar with, but he mentioned the fact that the TRS, the Teacher's Retirement System, the contribution from the state there is 13%, whereas the contribution to ORP is 9%, perhaps going up to 10%. So there's a rather large disparity between the contributions which he is not happy with but he doesn't quite know how to change it since he doesn't set those rates. We talked a little bit about the Affordable Care Act, and its impact on hiring and Dr. Bartels has also spoken of this, that is going to have a big impact on who we can hire, or how long, and what we can offer them in terms of benefits. So in the goal of insuring more people, it's going to cost money. The question is where's that money coming from. So we also, the Chancellor also in this brief meeting mentioned the funding formula, the new funding formula, for the University System, which still is rather fuzzy even from his perspective. He thought it in some ways it could work to the benefit some campuses, but no one is quite sure how it's all going to play out, and I don't know, I suppose we are going to have to see once it's implemented what actually happens. The, in a separate, on a separate matter, the *Statutes*, both the University-wide faculty vote on the University *Statutes* was, has essentially been

stymied by a lack of participation. So so far I have, know the tallies of the numbers of people who passed a vote, but it isn't enough. It isn't half of the voting faculty/corps of instruction so we, the ballot I know is still open, but in order to really make this legitimate it seems that we are going to have to re-do the vote starting in the fall, as early as possible. So that's where that is. In the meeting with President Keel, we talked a little bit about the Shooting Center, and we talked about the hiring of a director and he said he thought there might be a new director, but I don't even know who it was. So I wonder if Dr. Thompson could answer that question. Has there been a hire for the director of the Sports Shooting Center.

Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management): Yes, there has been. Tim Gauthier is a former 25-year military man and he's also been working in our Dean of Students Office for the past year. So he will take over July 1, I think, or I think it may be the middle of June, around that time.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair: Thank you very much. And lastly, an issue that Pat Humphrey brought up a couple of times which is going to impact a lot of people on campus, there's a no smoking ban on campus that's going into effect as of October 1. So, again, this is an issue that is going to be implementation of which is a little unclear. But it's coming soon and we'll just, you'll know come fall what's going to happen, Pat will be keeping us informed.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I'll just add a little something that just transpired in the last 24 hours. The Chancellor has called a System-wide meeting - every campus is sending people to this meeting to talk about the implementation of this ban and some examples of places that have already put, had this ban on their campuses for a period of time. We're putting together, the group of who will, to that and I am anticipating that we'll probably try to get somebody from Senate and somebody from the Student Government Association and others to come, depending on how many we can bring to that, as well, to at least share the conversation about what's happening.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair: Thank you. So and with that I'd like to say thank you to you all for allowing me to serve in this role for the past year. And to welcome Pat Humphrey as the new Senate Moderator for the coming year. So unfortunately we can't do any more today. We don't have a quorum, but thank you all for coming and good luck to you all. Yes, Fred.

Fred Smith (LIB): Robert, do you think there'd be anything at all to be gained by just asking for initial take, so to speak, on these motions whether they are questions or, do you think it we'll just be doing it in the fall again anyway.

Robert Costomiris (CLASS) Chair: I think it's better to wait until the fall. I really do. I think it's simply, I'm sorry that we can't finish this business today. But I just think that, so with that, have a nice summer.

Faculty Senate Minutes

Russell Union Ballroom

September 15, 2014

4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

Voting Members in Attendance: Lisa Abbott; Laura Agnich (for Nan LoBue); Olga Amarie; Helen Bland; Adam Bossler (for Janice Steirn); Sally Ann Brown; John Dyer; Steven Elisha; Richard Flynn; Tim Giles; Frank Goforth; Lucy Green; Ellen Hamilton; Mark Hanna; Jim Harris; Pat Humphrey; Devon Jensen; Scott Kersey; Gautam Kundu (for Susan Smith); Lindsay Larson; Li Li; Jim LoBue; Lawrence Locker; Alan Mackleprang; Karen McCurdy; Bryan Miller; Jessica Minihan; Lowell Mooney; Linda Mullen; Shahnam Navaee; Rob Pirro; Oscar Pung (for Lisa Yocco); Mosfequr Rahman; Marshall Ransom; Edward Rushton; Erroll Spence (SGA); Jim Stephens; Kathy Thornton; Mark Welford; James Woods; Rebecca Ziegler.

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Debbie Allen; Yasar Bodur; John Brown; Alina Iacob; June Joyner; Aniruddha Mitra; Marla Morris; Joe Ruhland; Lina Soares; Tiffanie Townsend; Tim Whelan

Administrators: Dr. Keel, Dr. Bartels, Dr. Davoud; Dr. Thompson, Dr. Abell

Visitors: Bob Fernekes; Lixin Li

Orientation Attendance: Basil Coates; Larisa Elisha; Paolo Gujilde; Shainaz Landge; Hani Samawi

1. **Approval of the Agenda for the September, 2014 meeting.**
2. **Approval of the June 4, 2014 Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary.**
3. **Librarian's Reports of September 15, 2014 Devon Jensen (COE), Senate Librarian.**
 - a. Undergraduate Committee Report (Chuck Harter, Chair)

- b. Graduate Committee Report: (Bob Fernekes, Chair) ***(Due to an oversight, the Graduate Committee was not called upon to make the motion to approve the April Graduate Committee Minutes.)***
- c. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: I ask Devon Jensen to present the Librarian's Report from June.

Devon Jensen (COE) Senate Librarian: I respectfully submit the Librarian's Report from the June 4 meeting. It was not approved due to the fact we didn't have enough for a quorum. There is one addition to that June meeting, there's a report from the from the Academic Advisory Committee [Academic Standards Committee] where they had some meetings over the summer, and most of them were added to the Senate Librarian's Report for this month. Approved.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Accepting the Librarian's Report simply means that we are strictly accepting it as factual, as each committee has submitted, and that we have no questions about it, the main report.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I have one question. Aren't the Librarian's Report and the minutes, aren't they supposed to be to us within a certain number of days before the meeting?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Yes, they are.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Because, frankly, I have not had time this morning when I got the Librarian's Report to read it.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Yes, they are, and we had some problems, well, yes. We'll do better in the future. Are there any other questions or comments about the Librarian's Report? All right, going back, approving the Librarian's Report just means that you accept the substance of each committee's report. You're not approving the committee's actions; you're just accepting those reports as true.

Devon Jensen (COE) Senate Librarian: I just wanted to update everyone, at least, on the current committee status so that everybody is aware of what is going on, and so that you can make

appropriate arrangements for your upcoming meetings this academic year. This is just for your information. Any questions or any concerns you may have about who may or may not be a chair for your particular committee, can direct that information to myself, Devon Jensen (devonjensen@georgiasouthern.edu), or to Ginger Malphrus (ginmal@georgiasouthern.edu)

- As it relates to the Academic Standards Committee, we currently have no chair for that particular one, although Diana Sturges, was the previous committee chair last year. **[update: Diana Sturges, Chair, 2014-2015]**
- Faculty Development Committee: we have two co-chairs for that particular committee: that is Padmini Shankar and Abid Shaikh. **(Staff person: Patricia Hendrix calls the first meeting)**
- For the Faculty Research Committee, we currently need a chair for this committee at this time. It should be noted that Bob Fernekes was last year's chair, and in the rules of the committee that individual responsibility to call the meeting for this year to elect a new chair. **[correction: Bob Fernekes is not on this committee this year. It is the staff person, in this case, Eleanor Haynes that calls the first meeting.]**
- Faculty Service Committee, again we are in a situation where we do not have a chair for this particular committee, and, in my looking, I wasn't able to find any chair from the last year, so we're going have to work on that a little bit, and we're also still needing a member from COBA to serve on that particular committee. **[Correction: Cynthia Frost was chair, 2013-2014]**
- Faculty Welfare Committee: We need a chair for this committee. **[Fred Smith, Library, Chair, 2014-2015]**
Cynthia Frost **[Correction: She was chair of the Faculty Service Committee]** was last year's chair and that person will be responsible for calling the committee for this year to elect a new chair.
- General Education Committee: We also need a chair for this particular committee, plus two members from CHHS and one from COBA. Jody Langdon was last year's chair and will need to call the meeting to elect a new chair for this committee. **[correction: one (Senate rep) needed now since Jody Langdon was elected again this year].**
- Graduate Committee ,the current chair is Bob Fernekes. He was voted in our last meeting that we held with the Graduate Committee and we met just last week. And we also need an alternate from CHHS **[filled-no longer needed]** and CLASS also needs a member and an alternate on the Graduate Committee **[filled-no longer needed]**. **[Audie Graham, Staff person for the Graduate Committee sets up the committee meetings.]**
- Library Committee: We also need a chair for this particular committee. Barbara Hendry was last year's chair and will need to call the meeting to elect a new chair for that particular committee.

- Senate Elections Committee, myself, Devon Jensen is the chair for that particular committee. We also need a member from CHHS for that particular committee. **filled-no longer needed**].
- Senate Executive Committee is chaired by Pat Humphrey; and the
- Undergraduate Committee, we currently have a chair, Chuck Harter. **[Ashley Canelon, staff person for the Undergraduate Committee sets up the meetings.]**

If any of these **(cannot understand)** are incorrect, or you know who currently is the chair for those committees, based on the information that I presented, should please contact myself so that we can get that information straightened out. Thank you.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Thank you. Time for Dr. Keel's President's Report

4. **President's Report (Brooks Keel):** Good afternoon. And I hope everyone's had a very pleasant and progressive, and great start to what I believe is going to be a great semester. It's been a busy summer for our University and **I am sure** some of you as well **and I wanted to provide** some brief updates on some of the things that have occurred over the summer. I mentioned some of these, I believe, at the Convocation, but just a couple of **important** ones I did want to mention.

CEIT

I want to give a real shout out to the College of Engineering **and Information Technology** who received their national ABET accreditation in their areas of Electrical, Mechanical, Civil Engineering programs. **This is a very big deal**, and, as you know, this is the ultimate stamp of approval for our programs **which is retroactive back to 2012**, so if you go from not having the ability at all to offer bachelor's degrees in engineering to **receiving the ability to offer Bachelor degrees, to having them accredited** is quite an accomplishment. **Congratulations to** to the college and I'm very proud of them and I know we all are **exceptionally pleased with their progress**.

Manufacturing Engineering

Along those lines, at the recent Board of Regents meeting, they approved Georgia Southern to offer a Bachelor's of Science Degree in Manufacturing Engineering. This, it will be one of about 20 or so programs in the entire country to offer a Bachelor's Degree in Manufacturing Engineering, and the only program in Southeastern United States. And, again, I cannot say enough about our engineering

program here and how well we are educating the next generation of engineers for the state of Georgia and beyond.

Coca-Cola

If you were at Convocation, you probably remember me mentioning that over the summer we signed a multi-year, multimillion dollar sponsorship agreement with Coca-Cola., the world's largest beverage company, and is continuing to work well on our campus and we are very, very proud of not only the amount of corporate sponsorship it gives us, but the ability to be able to use a large amount of that money towards scholarships. It is the indeed the largest corporate deal the University has ever had and will, and as I said, allow us to start putting money directly in the ability to attract and retain the greatest and best students around.

This particular corporate deal was a main offshoot of moving our athletic program to the FBS. There was a lot of concern about moving athletics up to the highest level and the potential costs associated with this move. However, because of the increased brand value, deals like this are now possible.

Part of the scholarship also allows us to double-match Governor Deal's Realizing Educational Achievement Can Happen, or the REACH needs-based scholarship program. We are becoming increasingly aware of the need for needs-based scholarship. Obviously so many of our students we're finding it more and more difficult today to afford to pay their bills and so this will give us a great opportunity to try to meet some of those students financial obligations.

Other News

Athletics has also signed a \$1 million dollar sponsorship for the Optim End zone of the stadium, which is another example of the benefit of moving FBS for increasing the brand of Georgia Southern and our ability to market that brand. We cut the ribbon on the newly renovated \$8.6 million Sanford Hall our colleagues in Communication Arts . I hope you are enjoying your new home; it has been a long time, I know in getting this facility in place, which is a wonderful opportunity to showcase Communication Arts. If you have not had a chance to go through that building, I really encourage you to do so. This is amazing example of adaptive reuse of existing facilities, keeping the integrity of Sweetheart Circle and an old 1939 building on the outside and completely renovating the inside for a state-of-the-art Communication Arts program. We are really excited about what this is going to do for our Comm Arts faculty and students down the road. We cut the ribbon on a \$10 million Football Operations Center, increased the seating at Paulson by 6,300, will give us not only the best venue for our football, athletics it will also allow us to

extend the use of Hanner Field House, the Iron Works, and the Parrish Building for the other athletic programs we have.

We are going to have two Thursday night football games: September 25th and October 30th and we fully appreciate that this will cause a bit of inconvenience. We will be bringing around 25,000 fans to Paulson at about the same time as everybody else is going home from work and moving around and changing parking. This, coupled with allowing visitors to come on campus is going to cause you some inconvenience, we know that; we ask your patience and your indulgence on this. It's an incredible opportunity for us to get word that Georgia Southern out to 75 million households that have ESPN, so this is a huge marketing opportunity for us to get the word of Georgia Southern out and that will significantly impact our ability to recruit students from all over the country.

I'm going to ask Rob Whitaker to just sort of give us an update on how he will be getting word out across campus the closer to September 25th game. This will, hopefully, give us an opportunity first-hand on what we plan to do on that particular day to address parking.

Rob Whitaker (Vice President for Business & Finance): Yes, again, as Dr. Keel said, patience is the first factor in dealing with the changes that we are going to make on Thursday night. Our plan we put together involves the basically Parking and Transportation staff, SGA, RAC, Facilities staff, as well as the Athletics staff and put together this plan, and while this plan we are going to use for next week's game, we recognize that we need to re-visit with SGA and other constituents to review the routes presented, as for positives/negatives in case we need to make some adjustments for that second Thursday night game. But here's the plan as we have it right now. Thursday night as it relates to Parking and Paulson Stadium, students can continue to use that parking lot until 12:00 noon. At 12:00 noon, we will close that lot down and not allow any new parking by students. They will be allowed to get their car out of that lot by 2:00. Close it down at 12:00. We ask them to have their cars out of that lot by 2:00 p.m. We will begin towing cars at 2:00 p.m. General parking will be allowed in that lot starting at 3:00 p.m. We will be allowing their slot, guarantee their slot at 3:00 p.m. in Paulson parking lot.

Move over to the RAC, students will be allowed to enter into the RAC up until 1:00 p.m. We will close that lot down for new entering traffic at 1:00 p.m. They must have their vehicles out of that lot by 3:30 p.m. We will begin towing at that point in time.

Tailgaters will be allowed to start parking in their guaranteed spots at 4:00 p.m. The adjustments to the transit system via the stadium bus stop which now stops at the little pavilion between Freedom's Landing and the stadium will move down to Malecki Road, we call that the football shuttle stop right there by the turnaround. That's where we'll be turning around and going back into campus with the transit system. At 1:00 p.m. they will wrap that up starting at 12:00 noon, that starts at 12:00 noon and at 1:00 p.m. The RAC bus stop will move from the pavilion at the RAC down actually onto Akins Boulevard. We will not drive buses up into that parking lot, we will stop on Akins Boulevard right there in front of the RAC and continue on a normal shuttle route. The Gold Route will have increased buses. We're going to have all the extra buses we have on that Gold Route. Those will start on game day around 4:00 p.m. to accommodate traffic going to the game as well as students, faculty, anybody using transit to get onto the campus.

The Blue Route will cease operation at 9:00 p.m. That's normal ceasing of operation time.

The Gold Route, the game day route, will continue one hour after the game ends that night to allow students to get back and forth. When we talked in our Parking office, we will stop enforcement of current parking at 12:00 p.m. on that Thursday game day, that's for all parking enforcement violations, except for fire lanes, handicapped, parking on sidewalks and emergency zones. So we'll not be ticketing people in the, basically the lots that are not secured by gates at 12:00 p.m. General admission or tailgating around campus, we're encouraging those folks who are coming to the game to not really start that until 4:00 p.m. That will be on a first-come, first-served basis in those commuter lots. We are going to go through the lot communication starting really this week into next Thursday. We are going to use a lot of social media; we're going to flyer parking lots that are affected on this Wednesday and Thursday so that everybody will know the beginning of next week is the week that we are going to really need to be out here. We are going to put signs up all over campus, probably starting on I-16 and working our way in. We're going to have a QR code set up so that people can access directly on up on their smartphones parking information to let them know where to go or where they can't go. And obviously we're going to be reaching out GSNews & gsinfo all the information out to faculty and staff and students about what's going to happen next week. That's all I have. I can hopefully answer any questions that anyone may have if this is the appropriate thing to do at this time.

Any questions?

Jim Harris (CEIT): 2:00 and 3:30 on Thursday are really prime times for classes, is there an alternate place for students to park on campus so that they don't have to

park at the stadium. I mean, I don't know how many students does this affects, does anybody have any idea?

Rob Whitaker (VPBF): We've actually, we've got a couple of things, we've done some parking studies and we realize that it is going to affect a good number of students. We have gone to SGA and spent time talking with them, we created signs and banners and then start getting the word out to students about all locations to park on campus. There's parking all around at different locations so it's the students choice of one place versus another; there is not, what we're doing is trying to identify the spaces down by Hanner, down by the softball fields, over by the Education in between those buildings, so we're checking and identifying those commuter lots that now are access points for them, encouraging car pooling, and other than that be patient

Brooks Keel (President): Other questions about Thursday night football? Thank you.

The last thing I just wanted to mention very briefly. Our enrollment, where we are today and what we hope to see for official enrollment this year. As of today, total enrollment is now down by 20 students. We are working feverishly to address this and feverishly to try to identify students who need a little help, possibly help them, making personal phone calls to a number to students who have either not paid their full registration fees as best we can to address their concerns. I will say that of great concern is the fact that we're down 107 graduate students this year this time compared to last year. It is of great concern. I am really asking the Deans and Chairs to pay special attention to this to see how we can affect our overall enrollment especially for those graduates. The financial aspect of it seems to a big decision. We're finding a number of students, hundreds of students, that are literally missing be able to pay a few hundred dollars on their bills. We are trying to find a ways we can adjust to help those students.

Enrollment is important for one reason because it significantly impacts our budget. Although we do know what the allocation from the Board of Regents will be until next spring, we are obviously very concerned about that and the impact of decreased enrollment will have. I want to thank all of you who have helped so tremendously in trying to make sure that we give the students assistance that they need. Any other, any questions that you have for me?

Pat Humphrey (COSM): You mentioned that beginning enrollment, is too late for students to begin enrollment fall semester at this point.

Teresa Thompson (Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Management): Pat, (cannot understand) enrolled is a matter of their (cannot understand) And that's the biggest thing that we're trying to work with the students on. As Dr. Keel said, sometimes its only \$300 to a \$1,000 and they're some students will just give up and there are ways to work with them and it's a small amount then (cannot understand) they can actually work out a small payment plan for a month or so, and so that's kind of what we try to do with those students. (cannot understand) additional money or whatever, SGA has been very good at looking at that, \$200 to \$300 range of students with money that SGA's raised. They are trying to help those students, so it's really (cannot understand).

Brooks Keel (President): (cannot understand) students that's why we are so excited about the Coke deal and what that (cannot understand) students (cannot understand) some more money at these (cannot understand) again, this (cannot understand) student for any reason, but you can't (cannot understand) student (cannot understand) college, but needs-based scholarship (cannot understand) Anything else? Thank you very much.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: At this time the Provost's report, Dr. Bartels.

5. Provost's Report: (Jean Bartels): I just have a couple of quick things to update you on, especially if you weren't here in June, I'll talk a little bit about SACSCOC compliance report. And I'll talk a little bit about QEP and about the University *Statutes*. In term of SACSCOC, we sent our final compliance report to our offsite SACSCOC team on September 10th, so that means that between now and approximately November, we'll be working hard on completing the QEP plan which is part of the next part of the compliance report. The offsite team will be reviewing the compliance report and they will be getting back to us no doubt with requests for a focus report. Usually that is a request for answering questions that our written report did not fully cover or an opportunity to address areas where they believed we were deficit in some particular way. We'll have the opportunity between the time we get the report, which will probably be late November, until late January to complete that focused report. Following that, the onsite review will take place March 31st through October 2nd. What they will do when they come to campus is review areas that the offsite people identified in the focus report which they believe are still not clarified. They also are required to look at several of the Federal requirement standards while they are on campus, regardless of whether those are satisfactory or not satisfactory in the off-site reviews. The majority of the time that they are on campus, they will be focusing on the QEP plan we submitted to determine whether it's an effective plan, whether it's a feasible to complete, whether it meets the needs of identifying issues on campus and whether its appropriately resourced. Before we sent the report to the SACSCOC office, we enlisted several offsite reviewers who are experienced SACS visitors to complete a review of the document. They looked in great detail at what we were reporting, and offered suggestions for areas where more detail or clarification was needed. Their report on our work was much more positive than we had originally hoped it would be.

In terms of the QEP, the Quality Enhancement Plan, I want to just alert you to, if you haven't looked at your emails yet today, to an announcement that identifies several new town hall meetings that will take place this week. One is September 17th, from 4-5 p.m. in the Williams Center Multipurpose Room; one is September 18th from 9-10 a.m. in the Williams Center Multipurpose Room. A draft report was attached to that email that provides an overview of the work of the development team and the multiple QEP teams

who worked on writing the QEP plan over the summer. This is where they are in terms of drafting the plan for discussion at the town hall meetings. I would also thank all those who assisted in the comprehensive surveys and discussions that assisted us in the writing of the QEP plan. We have solicited the assistance of the SGA to assist us with identifying a slogan for the QEP, Effective Writing. Once we have selected the slogan for the QEP, they will also help us market the QEP and its slogan to our constituencies. Hopefully we will have lots of suggestions from students. So, if you have students, please direct them to the competition and let them know about the prizes for the winner of that competition. I would like commend the SGA students for their work on the QEP—both their service on committees and their willingness to take on the slogan contest and help with marketing. They’ve been wonderful to work with. We have also been conducting campus interviews for two finalists for the QEP Director position. The interviews will take place on September 17th and on September 19th, both will be held in the William’s Center from 10:30 to 11:15 a.m. Those interview times are exclusively for faculty to be introduced to the candidates and we want as many people as possible to join in and give us your opinions about these potential QEP Directors.

And the last thing I wanted to share with you has to do with the University Statutes. You will remember at the beginning of the semester we asked all eligible faculty (as defined by the Board of Regents’ as eligible faculty) to vote on the revisions to the University Statutes. The new Statues were a result of a very comprehensive revision done by a faculty committee appointed by the President. The Statutes were last revised in the early 90s, and this group did a very good job of bringing us up to speed with changes that have taken place over the past ten plus years. There were 894 individual faculty who were eligible to vote, as of today we have a 60% return rate of 535 respondents. The proposed Statute revisions have to be adopted by the majority of the voting faculty. That would mean that we needed 448 “yes” votes to adopt the revised Statutes. Of the 535 respondents who chose to vote, 524 voted yes (98 percent); there were 11 “no” votes (2 percent). Thus, the revised Statues were adopted by the faculty. The President will now take the revised Statutes to the Board of Regents and ask for their approval as well. So thank you all for your effort to look at the Statutes and to vote for their adoption.

And that will conclude my report. I’ll take any questions that you might have. Yes.

Devon Jensen (COE): As it relates to the appointment for the QEP Director, is that a contract employment for a year or is the appointment forever?

Jean Bartels (Provost): Well, the QEP is a five-year commitment on the part of the University, so it should last for the time that the QEP is being implemented and a path for sustainability is created. We are expected to keep doing the QEP after the five-year reporting time. That would mean that there’s a possibility of continued employment for a QEP Director. What happens after the five year implementation period will depend on what happens to the QEP in general. In many instances these days, the ongoing work of the QEP allows those overseeing the activity that’s on campus to continue to support the work. It is not a tenured position; it’s not tenure-track position; so the initial appointment is for that initial five-year period for the implementation of the QEP.

This person is really being hired with QEP resources that we are required to devote to the QEP plan. We would need to solicit additional resources to support this individual following the implementation. That individual’s responsibility will be over five years and he/she will hold the position in order to complete the work of the QEP project. So in other words, the duration of the person’s time will depend on what transpires with the project over time. Okay, thank you.

6. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Since he's here, I'd like to recognize Fred Smith as the chair of our Statutes Committee.

The SEC report. There wasn't a whole lot of activity over the summer and through now. We had one [request for information](#) from Mark Hanna about numbers of students who attended graduation exercises, commencement exercises, who didn't graduate. The past ten graduations the number of students who didn't complete by graduation depends on how you want to think about things, ranged from roughly 16.4 percent to about 33 percent. Spring, summer, the count is a little bit different because they have people who are actually finished their degree requirements during the summer semester, haven't finished, so it gets a little bit fuzzy there, but overall if you took out graduation exercises who had not completed the graduation requirements its roughly in the 40 – 50 percent range.

And if you look at ones of have participated in graduation exercises who have never yet completed their degree you go back to Fall 2009, its roughly 100 there, spring summer 2011, three years ago, 240 students who took part in the graduation exercises and never finished their degree and so on. Monies, graduation fee for each student is \$35, (cannot understand) graduates, as the number of graduates has gone up, so has the dollars, the cost of the dollars expended has gone up, used to be FY 10 the amount collected was roughly \$40,000 more than most and (cannot understand) in FY 14, we actually spent about \$20,000 more than (cannot understand). Changes in cost for the programs would be, folders for the diplomas, etc. etc. That information was sent out to everybody and posted on the website as well. Any questions on that? (cannot understand)

There was one [request for discussion](#) item which the SEC chose not to place on the agenda. It came from Frank Goforth, CEIT, which relates to the new language for faculty searches about the Georgia Southern people must be able to work in this country without our (cannot understand). It has to do with the new rules or other rules from the Immigration Service and the Department of Labor. One of the things the Department of Labor says we should pay lecturers \$50,000 a year, the same as an Assistant Professor if they have Ph.D. One thing (cannot understand) if we were in Atlanta (cannot understand) pay that. The wording is appealable by any department chair, dean, to the Provost, if you feel truly causes a hardship for your search. If your search (cannot understand) in and you can't get (cannot understand) the Provost says assure me that such wording will be removed and you will be allowed to re-advertise. That's

what's up with that. (cannot understand) amount of manpower and money that we spend every year, hundreds of thousands of dollars processing fees (cannot understand) for those searches where (cannot understand) in (cannot understand) Are there any questions on that? There really wasn't a whole lot to discuss. Most of the agenda, as I said earlier, comes from the two meetings with some changes, revisions, in some of the motions. The next item of business here is the election of Senate Representatives (advance volunteers noted, other nominations from the floor) to some of the various committees we are supposed to send (cannot understand). The first one on the list is Intellectual Property Committee. The Intellectual Property Committee has to do with ownership of things that people create. Perhaps Dr. Patterson would like to (cannot understand) policy and he said he'd like to have the policy finished (cannot understand) revision finished by the end of this semester.

Dr. Charles Patterson (VP for Research and Economic Development and Dean, Graduate Studies): The Intellectual Property (cannot understand) the faculty and other representatives that is codified in the Faculty Handbook and as University Policy and (cannot understand) science and (cannot understand) to (cannot understand) assess RIP Policy (cannot understand) as it relates to (cannot understand). We'll be looking at that as well as updating our policy to be, well, updated based on changing intellectual property, rules, and regulations that are common at the federal level, state level, and universities interact with (cannot understand.) We'll be taking a good look at that and (cannot understand) necessity (cannot understand) policy and (cannot understand) by the (cannot understand).

a. Intellectual Property Committee (Rebecca Ziegler, LIB)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: I've had one previous nomination. Rebecca Ziegler from the Library. Are there any other nominations from the floor? Seeing none, all in favor of Rebecca Ziegler for Intellectual Property Committee, please say aye.

b. Athletics Committee (Kathy Thornton, CHHS): Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: The University Athletics Committee. Kathy Thornton from CHHS. (cannot understand) previously said she would be willing to serve on the University Athletics Committee. Are there any nominations from the floor? Seeing none, I'll ask everybody to approve Kathy Thornton by acclamation, please say aye. Thank you.

c. Parking and Transportation Committee: Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Parking and Transportation Appeals Committee, which is turns out it really functions strictly to look at appeals to basically (cannot understand) which applies to not only students, but us as well. Janice Steirn from CLASS has said she'd be willing to continue as that representative. Are there any

other nominations from the floor? Seeing none, we approve Janice Steirn by acclamation, please say aye. Thank you.

- d. Student Government Association: Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: (cannot understand) Student Government Association. Student Government reps can be very rewarding positions, and time consuming because the Student Government people spend a lot of time meeting (cannot understand). I have no previous nominations (cannot understand) SGA. Are there any nominations from the floor? Rebecca

Rebecca ??? senator or can it be an alternate.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: It could be an alternate, yes. Seeing none, think about it, and we will revisit this in October.

- e. Senate Parliamentarian: Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: I have one previous person who is (cannot understand) to serve and that was Jake Simons from COBA.

??? (cannot understand) COBA, Jake has had some second thoughts (cannot understand)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: any nominations from the floor for Senate Parliamentarian? Bob Cook who did the job for many years retired earlier this summer. Seeing none, I'll ask you to think about that one over the (cannot understand) next few weeks. In the interim time, (cannot understand) Okay, moving next we have a number of motions from the Faculty Welfare Committee relating to the Student Ratings of Instruction and I'll ask Fred Smith, who's the chair of the committee, (cannot understand).

7. Motions submitted by the Faculty Welfare Committee:

7.1. Appointment of an Ad Hoc Committee to draft a new Student Rating of Instruction

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: The first one (cannot hear or understand) appointment of an ad hoc committee to draft a new student rating of

instruction. The motion reads “Move that an ad hoc committee be appointed consisting of faculty with appropriate expertise to draft or recommend for purchase a new Student Rating of Instruction designed to measure teaching effectiveness.” (cannot hear or understand) rationale.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Since this is a committee motion, it does not require a second. Any discussion?

James Woods (CLASS): I would like to ask Fred what is the (cannot understand) want on a committee? Do you want representation from every single college on the committee? I’m just curious about that. What’s the nature of the ad hoc?

Fred Smith (LIBRARY): Jamie, I believe this is going to be the SEC’s decision. I don’t think it will be (cannot hear or understand).

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: We did a little bit of thinking last spring and early in the summer and (cannot understand) small and keep it, try to keep it people with expertise in the area, three people that have been suggested as interested (cannot understand) and able to deal with the issue Nan LoBue from CLASS and (cannot understand) CHHS, who were on the SRA committee last year, and Cordelia Zinskie from the College of Education and then we’d also like someone from SGA. If you put too many people on a committee, it gets hard (cannot understand) and difficult to impossible to meet. Rebecca

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): The motion as it was made says faculty, so if we are (cannot understand) representative from SGA so we may need to amend the (cannot understand) very much in favor of having a representative from SGA, but (cannot understand) motion.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Do we have a friendly amendment to amend the motion to include an SGA rep on the ad hoc committee?

??? so moved.

??? second

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: It has been moved and seconded. Okay. Fred?

Fred Smith (LIB): Someone else (cannot understand) change (cannot understand)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: All right. A motion to amend has to be taken first. All in favor of amending the original motion to include a representative from the SGA (cannot understand) please say aye. All opposed? Is there any further discussion on the now amended motion about forming an ad hoc committee to draft a new student ratings of instruction? Seeing none, all in favor. All opposed? **The motion carries.**

7.2. [Faculty Welfare Committee and best practices for evaluation of instruction](#)

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: Okay, the second one reads “Move that the Senate charge the Faculty Welfare Committee with describing a number of recommended best practices for the evaluation of instruction.” We move that (cannot understand) charges the Faculty Welfare Committee (cannot understand) instruction.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Again, this is a committee recommendation so it does not require a second. Is there any discussion of this motion to have the Welfare Committee look at the document and recommend (cannot understand) best practices for evaluation of student ratings of instruction. Seeing none, all in favor. All opposed? **The motion carries.**

7.3. [Amendment to Section 205.07, Student Ratings of Instruction in the Faculty Handbook](#)

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: (cannot understand) “Move to amend Faculty Handbook Section 205.07, Student Ratings of Instruction in the following manner:

Strike the last sentence which currently reads “Beginning in 2011, fully and partially online courses are evaluated via CourseEval.” Replace with “Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted.”

Add the following to the second sentence in the paragraph: “as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness.”

Add as a new paragraph the following to Section 205.07: As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced SRI scores.

The revised wording would read:

“Georgia Southern requires and conducts written or online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Twenty-three common items are supplemented with items selected by individual units and approved at the college level along with two open-ended questions. Department chairs return a summary of numerical results and students’ written comments to faculty each academic term; original responses are the property of the University. Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted.”

As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced SRI scores.”

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Again, this is a committee recommendation, so it does not need a second. Those of you who may not have the motion with you, printed out, easy to read, what I’ve got here on the screen is the current wording in the Faculty Handbook about the student ratings of instruction.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB) The twenty-three common questions that’s something that might change (cannot understand) ad hoc committee gets to work, so I wonder if we shouldn’t strike that (cannot understand).

(long pause on recording)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: All right, bear in mind, please, that this is the current wording. The proposed wording is the following: “Georgia Southern requires and conducts written or online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the

improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Twenty-three common items are supplemented with items selected by individual units and approved at the college level along with two open-ended questions. Department chairs return a summary of numerical results and students' written comments to faculty each academic term; original responses are the property of the University. Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted.

As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced SRI scores.”

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I would suggest that we strike the entire sentence that begins with “twenty-three” because that’s, I think, all of that could potentially change when the committee develops or establishes a new

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: (cannot understand) is that a suggestion or a motion to amend the motion?

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Well, I guess right now its just a suggestion for discussion.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: We can’t discuss unless we have a motion

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Okay.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: You make a motion to amend the motion.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I make a motion that we strike that entire sentence.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Is there a second to the amendment?

??? seconded

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: All right. We have an amendment on the floor to strike the sentence “Twenty-three common items are supplemented with items selected by individual units and approved at the college level along with two open-ended questions,” pending development of a potentially new instrument. Is there any discussion on that motion to amend the original motion?

Marshall Ransom (COSM): It seems to me that this change (cannot understand) this (cannot understand) description (cannot understand)

Richard Flynn (CLASS): I don’t see any need for this (cannot understand) in the Faculty Handbook to specify the instrument. (cannot understand) instrument (cannot understand)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Is there any other discussion of the amendment to strike the sentence that says that “Twenty-three common items are supplemented with items selected by individual units and approved at the college level along with two open-ended questions”? Seeing none, the motion on the floor is amending the motion to the Welfare Committee to strike this sentence that specifies that SEC: Is there any other discussion of the amendment to strike the sentence that says that “Twenty-three common items are supplemented with items selected by individual units and approved at the college level along with two open-ended questions.” All in favor of that amendment motion please say aye. All opposed? **The ayes carry.**

Now we are back to the amended motion that removes the twenty-three items sentence so the current wording of that motion would be :

“Georgia Southern requires and conducts written or online student ratings of instruction each academic term (excluding summer) to provide information to faculty for their use in the improvement of teaching. Results are also used in faculty evaluation as mandated by Regents policy as a portion of an evaluation of teaching effectiveness. Department chairs return a summary of numerical results and students’ written comments to faculty each academic term; original responses are the property of the University. Courses shall be evaluated by students in the same manner as the course is conducted.

As with any evaluation, faculty shall have the right to respond to student ratings regarding factors that might have influenced SRI scores.” That’s the motion as it now stands on the floor. Is there any discussion? Further discussion?

John ??? (COBA): Why do we want to prevent ourselves from (cannot understand) traditional classes (cannot understand) organization (cannot understand), as I reads we have evaluation (cannot understand) traditional (cannot understand) waste my time (cannot understand) evaluation, and so (cannot understand).

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: That's (cannot understand) research, as indicated several times that if it's a face-to-face class and (cannot understand) evaluation the response rate (cannot understand) evaluation (cannot understand) dismally low. This (cannot understand), which actually (cannot understand) the Handbook is recommended by SRI committee that in 2006-2007 and again now. Any other questions or comments? Discussion on the motion? Seeing none, all in favor. All opposed? **The motion passes.** Last one, Fred.

7.4. Clarification of the Role of Student Ratings of Instruction in Teaching Evaluation

Fred Smith (LIB) Chair, Faculty Welfare Committee: The motion reads "Amend the Faculty Handbook by adding the following paragraph to section 205.01, Criteria for All Types of Teaching Evaluation:

Student Ratings of Instruction shall not be the sole measure of teaching effectiveness for any review, nor shall instructors be ranked according to student ratings for evaluation; rather, a complete picture should be obtained through multiple sources. Documentation of teaching effectiveness is the responsibility of the faculty member."

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: (cannot understand) adds a new paragraph to the SRI paragraph of the Faculty Handbook. Once again, this is a committee recommendation so it does not need a second. Is there any discussion?

??? (cannot understand) Question (cannot understand) which was to what extent administrators (cannot understand) using (cannot understand)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Good question. (cannot understand) Dr. Bartels wants to address that because I know how administrators evaluate faculty has always been a hot button issue.

Dr. Jean Bartels (Provost); How can (cannot understand) I guess as well as we could (cannot understand) I suppose (cannot understand) I think what needs to be happen is the work of the Faculty Welfare Committee looking at the complexity of evaluating teaching practice (cannot understand) and that (cannot understand) additional best practices (cannot understand) I think there are absolute agreement that that should (cannot understand) in my personal experience that is always been the case in evaluation of teaching (cannot understand) multiple (cannot understand) evaluating (cannot understand) teach (cannot understand) instruction (cannot understand) service, as the sole evaluation point (cannot understand) teaching any evaluations (cannot understand) so I think it is (cannot understand) understanding (cannot understand) my only, I think, this motion will make it clear that we develop a comprehensive (cannot understand) that (cannot understand) faculty (cannot understand) demonstrate and show evidence for (cannot understand) above and beyond this rating of instruction (cannot understand). Sole source. I don't know that it is a matter of training people to do it, it's a matter (cannot understand) additional (cannot understand) process and absolutely that whole (cannot understand) Faculty Welfare Committee (cannot understand).

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Are there any other questions, comments, discussion on the motion? The motion, in essence, "Amend the Faculty Handbook by adding the following paragraph to section 205.01, Criteria for All Types of Teaching Evaluation:

Student Ratings of Instruction shall not be the sole measure of teaching effectiveness for any review, nor shall instructors be ranked according to student ratings for evaluation; rather, a complete picture should be obtained through multiple sources. Documentation of teaching effectiveness is the responsibility of the faculty member."

Recording skips anything related to the motion below. And takes up with Sally Brown's comments.

8. Motion submitted by the Academic Standards Committee

8.1. Changes to the "early alert/midterm grade" policy

(unidentified) ??? (cannot understand)

Sally Brown (COE): It is designed to, it should follow that, dropdown menu, change, but you'll see other options when you go (cannot understand).

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC: Well, I know, (cannot understand) Is there any other discussion, questions about the motion, now amended to take effect for Spring 2015. Seeing none. All in favor please say aye. All opposed? **The motion passes.**

9. Unfinished Business

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC : Is there any unfinished business? Is there any new business? Are there any announcements from the vice presidents? Are there any announcements from the floor?

10. New Business

11. Announcements: Vice Presidents

12. Announcements from the Floor

Erroll Spence (SGA) (cannot understand) Student Government (cannot understand). President Keel and some members of the faculty answer any questions that they may have and the Student Government Association.

Mark Welford (COSM): Faculty Senate Secretary: (cannot understand) VP's (cannot understand) and to make sure you sign the rolls please.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and Chair, SEC : Yes, very important. So Ginger can have people sign the roll. May I have a motion to adjourn? So moved. Second? All in favor? Opposed?

13. Adjournment.

Faculty Senate Minutes
October 8, 2014
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Lisa Abbott, Olga Amarie, (Hani Samawi for Helen Bland), Yasar Bodur, Sally Ann Brown, Larisa Elisha, Steven Elisha, Richard Flynn, Tim Giles, Frank Goforth, Ellen Hamilton, Mark Hanna, Jim Harris, Pat Humphrey, (Shainaz Landge for Alina Iacob), Devon Jensen, Scott Kersey, Lindsay Larson, Li Li, Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Alan Mackelprang, Karen McCurdy, Bryan Miller, Jessica Minihan, Lowell Mooney, Marla Morris, Linda Mullen, Rob Pirro, Marshall Ransom, Edward Rushton, Lina Soares, Janice Steirn, James Stephens, Kathy Thornton, Tiffanie Townsend, Mark Welford, Tim Whelan, Jianqiang Zhao, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members Not in Attendance: Debbie Allen, John Brown, John Dyer, Lucy Green, June Joyner, Nan LoBue, Anriduddha Mitra, Shahnam Navaee, Mosfequr Rahman, Joe Ruhland, Susan Smith, James Woods, Lisa Yocco, Errol Spence

Administrators in Attendance: Brooks Keel, Steve Burrell, Russell Keen, Rob Whitaker, Martha Abell, Greg Evans, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Bob Fernekes, Rocio Alba-Flores, Christine Ludowise, Diana Cone, Maura Copeland, Barry Balleck

1. Approval of the Agenda for the October 8, 2014 meeting.

- 2. Approval of the September 15, 2014 Minutes:** Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary. Can I have approval for the minutes please? They were in terrible condition because we couldn't understand most of what was said. So I apologize for that and the President and the Provost very kindly gave us their script, but the rest is a nightmare. So I apologize for that.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): Could I suggest, the minutes really ought to be an accurate representation of what was said at the meeting? Could I suggest that maybe for those parts where you couldn't understand what was on the tape that you might send it to the speaker and ask the speaker to fill in? And also I wonder if speakers might be allowed to essentially copyedit what they said to change it from the way we normally speak, which doesn't sound good in writing to the way we would normally write, and this is done in oral history circles because I worked for a time at an oral history archive and we did in fact copyedit the transcripts of the tapes to make it sound good in writing. I think that if we did that the minutes would be a much better record, going out to the future of what happened at the meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: That could get to be unwieldy. I mean, certainly in certain circumstances.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): Could I ask, do we have a quorum for this meeting?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Yes, we do. I've got it. Mark, do you have any suggestions on that? Certainly I think it might be in order if people want to correct their part of the last month's meeting that could possibly be arranged,

Mark Welford (COSM): That certainly could be arranged. We certainly felt that it was a necessity to have that with regard to the President and Provost. But if other individuals when they see the transcript, see that it was unintelligible and they wish to contribute to clarify, I'm open to that, as long as I don't spend hour upon hour doing that. I do have other expectations.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: All right, in that case, subject then to possible future amendments by those who spoke and would like to correct the unintelligible parts of their speech, could I have a vote on approval of the minutes? All in favor, please say aye. All opposed? ***The minutes are approved, subject to being emended in the future.***

3. **Librarian's Reports of October, 2014 Devon Jensen (COE), Senate Librarian:** At this time I'd like to respectfully submit the Librarian's Report for the October 2014 Faculty Senate meeting with the report that was submitted last week as well as the amended piece that was added today to the minutes.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Bearing in mind that accepting the Librarian's Report merely accepts the committee's reports included therein have actually described what happened at their meetings and we are not formally approving or disapproving their actions unless they bring a motion to the floor of the Senate, all those in favor of accepting the Librarian's Report, please say aye. All those opposed? ***The Librarian's Report is approved.*** Undergraduate Committee, did not have something in the Librarian's Report, but I understand they've met twice this year. Chuck Harter is the chair, is he here? Is there anyone from the Undergraduate Committee who would like to report?

a. Undergraduate Committee Report (Chuck Harter, COBA)

Marla Morris (COE): There was some discussion at the meeting about the Registrar's office making some changes and so, there was talk about not having meetings next semester, and there was some discussion about that.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Any decision?

Marla Morris (COE): They said they would take a look at the next meeting.

- b. **Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes, LIB):** Thank you. The Librarian's Report includes the Graduate Committee minutes from the April and September meetings. I make a motion for their approval.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: This is a committee report, so it does not require a second. Is there any discussion on the Graduate Committee minutes? Seeing none, in this case, I'm going to remind everyone that in approving the Graduate Committee minutes we're also recommending to the President and Provost that they make the curriculum changes included therein. This is a vote to approve curriculum changes. All in favor please say aye. All opposed? ***The Graduate Committee report is approved.***

- c. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report (Michelle Cawthorn, COSM)-No report.
4. **President's Report (Brooks Keel):** Thank you very much, and my report will be fairly brief. First I do want to commend Professor Welford for trying to interpret these minutes. They actually sent me a part that I actually gave and asked me to fill in the blanks. It was virtually impossible for me to know what I said, so I can imagine what it must feel like trying to interpret everyone else. I do very much appreciate the efforts with that. Hopefully, the technical difficulties have been worked out. Just a couple of things I do want to mention.

Presidents' Retreat

The System office had a Presidents' Retreat last week and all the Presidents got together and let me just give you a couple of things that came from that and may be of interest to you.

Funding Formula

As you know, we have been giving you a heads up that the formula that is used to fund the University System of Georgia for the legislature was supposed to be changed effective this coming fiscal year. That has been postponed for at least a year and I am asking Rob Whitaker if he could correct anything I am saying wrong at this point. As you know, the new formula that was to be implemented was based solely on productivity, productivity of students. The formula that we are currently funded under was more or less a headcount -- really, it was a

credit hour count formula. The legislature would like to have more information about what the new formula will look like before it is implemented and therefore we have postponed that for a year. So as it is right now, as we go into this next legislative session the money that will be allocated to the University System of Georgia will be based on the formula that we have been under for the last 15, 20 years or so. We will hopefully provide you updates as we learn, like I said, I just learned this past week myself and you can imagine the hair pulling Rob's been doing trying to get us ready for the new formula and now it's being postponed for a year

Sexual Violence

The other thing is the Chancellor has created a system wide committee that is to look at each campus to determine how well we are prepared for and deal with issues of sexual violence. And as you all know, this is an extremely important aspect of all campuses, especially for us in the system. He has appointed members throughout the system. We have two individuals from this campus that serve on that committee: Azell Frances who is the President of the SGA and is going to be representing the students on that committee. We are very proud that she is there, and Gary Gawel from our Diversity Office will also be on that as well. This will be a committee who will meet over the next year or so and we will keep you informed as it comes about, but you know there's a huge national interest in this area, and a tremendous amount of attention being placed on the subject. The Chancellor just wants to make sure that all the campuses are addressing this critical world issue in the way in which they should. The Provost is in Atlanta at a system provost's meeting, so is not here. I did talk to her and she did not have any major issues to bring forward to you. At this point I will open it up for any questions you might have, any issues that you are aware of that I missed.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I am wondering whether there was any discussion about the delay in implementing the new formula in terms of concerns from the legislature.

Brooks Keel (President): Well that is a great question. And I am going to ask Rob if he is aware of specific details as I cannot address that specifically.

Rob Whitaker (VPBF): We weren't provided any specifics more than just allowing them time to review the proposed formula and do some modeling to make sure that it was a model formula that all sides could agree to and feel comfortable with.

Brooks Keel (President): Interestingly enough, and it surprised me that the Chancellor is getting some vibes, if you will, that's not a technical term, from the legislature that they would like to find a way to stop the new formula; this was a reassuring and surprising statement so I think they really want to make sure that they are not going to implement something that is going to harm a campus by completely changing the way in which they have done in the past. I don't know any other information than that.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): Just to follow up with one more question. And this might be a very naïve question, but I wonder if there is any discussion about the correlation between family

means and progression. The whole question of progression is whether a student can graduate. Is this being taken into account, because some universities are attracting students who have less means and some with more means and so on.

Brooks Keel (President): There are some pieces to the formula that deal students with less means or more means, I believe, Rob, I'm correct, which will give to that. And if any other, there's some other unique aspects with the formula that address student need. Rob Whitaker, do you want to comment on that?

Rob Whitaker (VPBF): The need-based portion of the formula, which is kind of like an add-on for progression is a piece to the formula developing so that's the only part that really addresses need. Non-traditional students is another factor. And other things relative to research and other things. We as an institution have never seen the formula, we are just going, based on again, the information that has been provided to us as it relates to factors that we are going to consider. But to see an actual lump of this money for students, we have not seen that

Brooks Keel (President): To be honest, I'm actually a little more comfortable knowing that we are going to go into this next legislative session with the existing formula to work from, as opposed to having to completely change directions, because we just haven't been receiving enough information to know what to do. To approach a year with production being part of the formula is radically different from headcount. Obviously we are still concerned about headcount—always be concerned about headcount of students, but when you start getting into productivity and progression that's a whole different story.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I had one question; now I have two. The first one is has there been a side-by-side comparison of current funding formula and what it would be if the new one was in place so we could actually see what differences are there?

Brooks Keel (President) No, I think that's part of what they are going through now. What I was told, was that whenever they do implement the new formula that you will be essentially at a zero-base. In other words, in fact, they are actually going to use, they are going to back into the formula to make sure that if Georgia Southern got \$20 million this year, with a strong new formula, you will get \$20 million that year and then the productivity piece will roll into it moving forward. It really was designed not to harm any institution from an optimistic increase to the institution based off of when it was implemented.

Rob Whitaker (VPBF): that's correct. It was meant to be "hold harmless" in the first year and that allowed for metrics that they were chasing to be progression and graduation to come in the second year after the first year of backing into your base budget from the prior year.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): That leads to my second question. I'm kind of surprised to hear that we haven't seen the formula. Is there a way to get a hold of the formula because then we could at least internally look at how is this going to affect? Because it's really nice to hear that it's, a harmless intention, but it will be even nicer to see some data.

Brooks Keel (President): You are absolutely right. Believe me, that's why I say I'm actually feeling pretty good about the fact that we are not going to have to implement a new formula right now because the information we had was very general in nature so much so that we couldn't start running models ourselves to determine based off how many students were 15, 36, or 90 hours. What impact that is going to have now, we'll be able to do projections based off historical projections to see where we would have been and how we might fare going forward. . We just haven't been able to do any of that. We really and truly have been waiting for the formula to come out with enough information so we can actually start plugging in numbers, and I get the feeling that there was enough uncertainty about this because its why you are seeing sort of a hold back on it until we can get some of these issues resolved. I will give you one example. The issue of transient students was not even discussed when this was first presented. We raised the issue that at Georgia Southern we have a unique position with East Georgia campus right down the street. We have hundreds of transient students that come to us, but who gets credit for those students is it East Georgia, is it us, do we get to, because we are not credit hour type basis with that particular formula. Transfer students are a whole other issue. When a student graduates from a two-year campus and transfers to us they get some credit for graduating a transfer student, but how does that student factor into us? It's a very complicated issue and I just don't think all the details have been worked out which is why it's wise hold off. I wish we could provide you with more information, believe me, if we had it we would. We'd be happy to do that, but that's just where we are now. I appreciate your question. Yes.

Devon Jensen (COE): President Keel, you mentioned in your report that it was going to be put off for the next fiscal year so just for clarification because we are already starting to look at possible changes in terms of our program and how we count and address our student issues, so this is, what are we talking like June 2015 or we talking about January 2016, what was the kind of expectation?

Brooks Keel (President): It will be July 2016 I believe before any new formula would come into place. We are basically, this is how we've always done until July of 2016 which the amount legislated to the University System of Georgia will be based on performance 2016 and then the allocation to us will come from there. Now, obviously Retention, Graduation, and Progression, those are still key. We are obviously still going to be focused on those issues, regardless of the formula we have to deal with, but in terms of trying to have a feeling for what our budget might look like down the road it will be based on headcount. Incidentally speaking of headcount when I looked today, I believe we were five over last year. That's five students, not 5%, which means we are in the plus column and that's a good thing for us. As best we can tell, I know many of you already know this, if you look at institutions not just Georgia Southern, but across the country, you look at enrollment trends. There is a chilling effect across the country about what projections are being made. By that I mean, most universities are planning to be stable at best and are going to have to work hard to be stable. There's a lot of reasons for that, the economy, the sheer number of students that are coming out of high schools, the quality of the students that are coming out of high school—I mean, those that actually qualify to get into college. We also know that the demographic of the

students will be changing dramatically in the next three to five years; we'll see a much greater percentage of Hispanics. A lot of those individuals as you should know are first generation students and they have very special needs that I think we need to try to prepare for to make sure that we can help those students be successful as they possibly can, and we are already seeing a tremendous growth in our Hispanic population of students. We are going to be in a situation I think for the next three to five years to where total enrollment will be growing from 20,500 now to 25,500 now, in 15-10 we are going to be in good shape. But we are pleased that this year we are going to be up five from last year and that's a good thing. Anything else? Thank you.

5. **Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.):** The SEC Report. This month basically there were two motions discussed. As I said, we are withdrawing from consideration the one about a motion passing with a majority of votes cast to clarify what passes a motion. We included in the agenda is the one allowing the Faculty Athletic Representative to succeed him/her(self) an indeterminate number of times subject to Senate approval. We had a lot of discussion on the results of the RFI from last month on graduation in terms of how many people who walk in graduation ceremonies are actually graduating. The results were really rather chilling. It needs further study in terms of what we may or may not want to do. The last time Faculty Senate did anything about graduation ceremonies was in 1999, when the summer graduation ceremony was eliminated and at that point that was when we allowed prospective summer graduates to march in the May ceremony. However, actually in terms of my own interest we are appalled in terms of what goes on in the Fall ceremony. Upwards of 22% of students who walk in that ceremony really aren't graduating that semester, and talking about retention, progression, and graduation hundreds of these students who have walked in ceremonies still have not officially graduated two or three or four or five years later. So we discussed various options one of which is delay the graduation at the end of the semester. I don't know how viable that is. Another option is to try and put some kind of curb on who actually attends those ceremonies. I've tried to talk to Velma Burden, Registrar, in terms of what kinds of checks are put on there. The information I got back from her about that is that students are eligible to walk if they have a graduation application that lists that semester, however, we all know that those graduation checklists are done two or three semesters ahead of time and things may change. I don't know is there any audit of those done in terms of are they really on track still? So we've got to try to find that out. We had lots of discussion about that. Next month is November. It's the time of year to elect next year's Faculty Senate Moderator. Get to stand up here. Get to carry the Mace in three December graduation ceremonies and sit on the stage for the whole three hours in the May ceremony. Get to sit down and have a nice chat with Dr. Keel every month and Dr. Bartels, chair the SEC meetings. So consider becoming Faculty Senate Moderator for next year. It's a one-year position, see what happens. Does take a fair amount of time. There is a history of a release for one course per semester for the Faculty Senate Moderator. There is also a summer stipend as Faculty Senate Moderator, which got put in after a few years ago when they couldn't find anybody to be Faculty Senate Moderator. Which leads me to another point that we didn't have a lot of discussion about in the SEC and I also discussed it with Dr. Bartels this month is the idea of service to the University to profession, etc. The three legged academic stool has somewhere along the lines lost that third leg of service in a lot of cases,

trying to get people to run to be on Faculty Senate, to volunteer for a Faculty Senate officer position, to volunteer for other committees. It is getting to be really, really tough and I don't know exactly what the answer is; we have to run the University, which takes service from all of us. We also have to serve our departments and professions; I know several who are very active in professional associations and so on, myself included. It can stem from all kinds of issues, but I might just open this up for a little bit of discussion here. What are the impediments? One thing that Dr. Bartels and I discussed are, two things, one is possibly having a some sort of recognition for people that do an extraordinary amount of service perhaps it would be at the Spring faculty meeting. Not everybody wins the only two Awards for Excellence for Service every year, but there are a lot of people who do a lot of other services. Maybe have it really count for something, get recognized formally, The other thing that we discussed is she was going to talk with the Deans in terms of relooking at promotion and tenure requirements and really make verified service a bigger part of the promotion packet. In other words, it's not just put your name on that you are on this committee, but did you really do something. Anybody want to say anything about that in terms of trying to have people do things?

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I pretty much have to say something about everything. I don't think the problem is that we've lost that third leg; I think the problem is that we're heavily overburdened and if its lip service everybody says oh, yes, we value service, but it really doesn't count for anything. When we are evaluated every year, and then of course the big ones tenure, promotion, post-tenure, all of that, and it's like okay what have you done, what really counts is teaching and research, and we have a big upheaval about what's happening in research, how much more is it going to count, how much more you need to do, and that, the upheaval with what went on in research and teaching. I think it's led directly to more if any work and we have committees on committees, and I think we actually have something called committee on committees somewhere. I'm afraid it sounds like a student who says how many points do we get for that, and I don't want to sound like that, but we're all beat up. And to try and be an excellent teacher, a productive researcher, and still serve on tons of committees that all require work is just too much to ask from faculty if you want them to be good at what they are doing.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Any other comments?

Jim Harris (CEIT): What I found, Pat, service work is, you've got a couple of faculty members in each department who get overloaded on service mainly because they do a good job for service. And so they are asked to do again and again and again, and you have other faculty in a department who do a crummy job of service, and then they're never asked to do anything. So, you know this has happened at every school I have been in. I can't bring myself to do a crummy job. You know, as much as it would help my career.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Speaking from experience, Jim. I think you're right.

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I am inclined to think that it might be better to get rid of this notion of the three legged stool and the three categories that counting on points in each category just step back and say take a broader view that each person here has to be, has to show that they are contributing to how to put it, the furthering of knowledge and that that can happen in these three categories. It could happen by teaching, it could happen by research, and it could happen by just, you know, keeping this university working or given the professional organizations working and maybe for tenure and promotion that people should have to write a statement on, well, listing all their activities, but then explaining how their activities have contributed to this general goal of furthering knowledge and some people may gravitate towards service when they know that it will be respected in that way as an important contribution to further acknowledge.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Any other comments?

Mark Welford (COSM): With regard to writing up those tenure and tenure and all that we already in COSM and most other colleges have to give a narrative, but if you take this further in your ideas then you get back to the pathways committee that I was chair of and I think most people would not want to go back down that route, unless people's ideas have changed.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Anyone else? Think about it. I think we will try and start some other discussion in terms of this what can we do? Along those same lines that's another topic for a meeting I'll be attending at Georgia Gwinnett College Friday and Saturday, just letting people know that the University System Faculty Council is meeting this weekend, and we have many any items on our list of things that we are going to discuss. If you have questions or things you'd like me to discuss, please send them to me. The Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor for Academics Houston Davis will both be there, so we do have faculty perspectives to the System office. And that's the end of my report for right now.

Elections of Senate Representatives (advance volunteers noted, other nominations from the floor):

a. Student Government Association (Marian Tabi and Ellen Hamilton)

Next item on the agenda some elections of representatives that were not completed last month. Student Government Association. Marian Tabi from CHHS, School of Nursing, and Ellen Hamilton, also from CHHS, School of Nursing have agreed to split that job, so we'll have two SGA reps which actually meets the approval of Azell Frances. She said it would be better to have two involved SGA reps than one uninvolved. So I'd like to place those names in nomination and are there any other nominations from the floor?

Devon Jensen (COE): Could you please repeat those two names?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Marian Tabi from CHHS and Ellen Hamilton also from CHHS. Any other nominations from the floor? Seeing none, shall we thank these people for their additional service by acclamation?

b. Senate Parliamentarian (Karen McCurdy, Parliamentarian)

Senate Parliamentarian, Karen McCurdy from CLASS in Political Science has agreed to serve as Parliamentarian. Are there any other nominations from the floor? Seeing none, let's thank Karen for agreeing to serve in this position. All right, we have one motion to discuss tonight and that's a motion about the Faculty Athletic Representative, which is an amendment to the Bylaws. Jim Harris is going to present the motion.

6. Motions to amend the Faculty Senate By-Laws

6.2 Motion to allow the Faculty Athletic Representative to succeed him(her)self an indeterminate number of times (Jim Harris, CEIT): "Amend Section 109.04 of the Faculty Handbook (Faculty Senate By-Laws), Article III, Section 5e, shall be as follows: nominate one faculty member to serve as the institutional representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association. This appointment must be confirmed by a majority vote of the Faculty Senate. There shall be a one-year apprenticeship prior to becoming the institutional representative. The institutional representative shall serve a six-year term of office (a total of seven years) and may succeed himself/herself. And that's the changes that were made once so apparently (cannot hear him well) succeed yourself once and now it could go on indefinitely, "In cases where the institutional representative has been elected to office in the Sun Belt Conference (and it was the Southern Conference) and the term of that office exceeds the six-year term, the President of the University, in consultation with the Senate Executive Committee, may extend the term of the institutional representative to coincide with the term of the elected office in the Sun Belt Conference. Such an extension shall normally be limited to no more than two years." So the two changes were made (cannot hear him well) and we changed Southern to Sun Belt.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: Is there a second to the motion? Discussion?

Ellen Hamilton (CHHS): Am I reading it right that some of these changes are actually driven by Sun Belt regulations? That was kind of my reading on it; being a Sun Belt athletic representative has been kind of an ongoing person who is familiar with Sun Belt regulations.

Brooks Keel (President): That's essentially the case. There was no policy is Sun Belt is driving this, but the vast majority practices in all of the FBS institutions is that the individual can serve multiple terms. Incidentally, Chris Geyerman apologized for not being here today he had class today, so he wasn't here to discuss this motion and he is more than willing to serve an additional term in this position. I had asked the SEC to present this and I certainly appreciate them doing this. The main thing here is that if you have someone who serves in this role and does a good job and represents you all and this university very well and you are pleased with that person you will give an opportunity to serve multiple terms. However, having said that, even with the change proposed, every six years it will come back to you for reappointment, so you will still have the option of putting someone else in that position, and not putting it in a situation where the institution can have someone serve for thirty years.

James Stephens (COPH): We had quite a discussion on this in the Senate Executive Committee. This is a very complicated position that has to be very familiar with NCAA regulations that change constantly. And the representative that we've had for a number of years has done an excellent job in representing not only Georgia Southern, but Athletics in general, and so with that we felt the change was necessary. And we keep a person who is highly interested in this job and well known, and well trained in NCAA regulations, which is harder than just the Sun Belt regulations.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): I think it is a good idea. I think that because we need to have one year, what is it called, apprenticeship, that we only need to make sure because somebody is like continuing to replace him or herself or whatever that we do and we may already have this, have something in place so that they need to let us know when they can have more or need to be their last six-years or whatever, so that we can get that apprenticeship in place.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Senate Moderator and SEC Chair: We certainly know when the term is up. I guess the only issue would be the same as it is now if someone was the FAR and wanted to resign their position in the middle of a term.

Is there any discussion on this motion? Any further discussion? Okay, after consulting our Bylaws, Article V, Section 2, indicates that amending the Bylaws of the Faculty Senate requires having a motion on a regular agenda, which this has been, and also requires a two-thirds vote of those present. So in doing so, and to assure we have a two-thirds vote of those present, I am going to ask for a vote by show of hands. All those in favor, please raise your right hand. All those opposed? **Motion carries.** I counted one person that didn't vote. Is there any new business? Is there old business? Are there any announcements from the vice presidents? Are there any announcements from the floor? Do I have a motion to adjourn? All in favor. We stand adjourned.

6. New Business - none

7. **Old Business - none**
8. **Announcements: Vice Presidents - none**
9. **Announcements from the Floor - none**
10. **Adjournment.**

Faculty Senate Minutes
November 19, 2014
4:00 to 6:00 P.M.
Russell Union Ballroom

Voting Members in Attendance: Lisa Abbott, Olga Amarie, Helen Bland, Yasar Bodur, Larisa Elisha, Steven Elisa, Richard Flynn, (Mete Akcaoglu for Lucy Green), Ellen Hamilton, Mark Hanna, Jim Harris, Pat Humphrey, (Emil Iacob for Alina Iacob), Devon Jensen, Scott Kersey, Lindsay Larson, Li Li, Jim LoBue, Lawrence Locker, Karen McCurdy, (Bob Fernekes for Jessica Minihan), Lowell Mooney, Marla Morris, Linda Mullen, Shahnam Navaee, Rob Pirro, Mosfequr Rahman, Marshall Ransom, Edward Rushton, Lina Soares, Erroll Spence, Janice Steirn, (Marian Tabi for Kathy Thornton), Tim Whelan, James Woods, Jianqiang Zhao, Rebecca Ziegler

Voting Members not in Attendance: Debbie Allen, John Brown, Sally Ann Brown, John Dyer, Frank Goforth, June Joyner, Nan LoBue, Alan Mackelprang, Bryan Miller, Anridduha Mitra, Joseph Ruhland, Susan Smith, Jim Stephens, Tiffanie Townsend, Mark Welford, Lisa Yocco

Administrators: Jean Bartels, Steve Burrell, Russell Keen, Teresa Thompson, Martha Abell, Barry Joyner, Bede Mitchell, Curtis Ricker

Visitors: Jayne Perkins Brown, Chuck Harter, Maura Copeland, Christine Ludowise

- 1. Approval of the Agenda for the November 19, 2014 meeting.**
- 2. Approval of the October 8, 2014 Minutes: Mark Welford (COSM), Senate Secretary.**
- 3. Librarian's Reports of November, 2014 Devon Jensen (COE), Senate Librarian.**
 - a. Undergraduate Committee Report (Chuck Harter, COBA)**

Recording begins here: ??? Recording is bad.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Any other questions in regards to the Undergraduate Committee Report? I will remind everyone that in moving the committee report of the Undergraduate Committee we are asking the Provost and President to accept these curriculum and course changes and make those changes. All in favor of accepting the recommendations of the Undergraduate Committee from their September and October meetings, please say aye. All opposed. Thank you. One thing about the Undergraduate Committee that I might mention to people is that I noticed looking at these minutes myself is that technically neither the September or October did they have a quorum.

Chick Harter (COBA): I think we did, we counted up, we barely made it.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Okay. I noticed more names on the absences than there were on the present.

Richard Flynn (CLASS): We can't call over and ask for a quorum once the meeting is already taking place, so whatever happened, happened.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Right, but I'm just trying to remind all the Senators who may be on the Undergraduate Committee to please go, and if you cannot attend a meeting, there should be an alternate from each college. Get your alternate. Bob Fernekes, the Graduate Committee report.

b. Graduate Committee Report (Bob Fernekes, LIB)

Bob Fernekes (LIB): The Librarian's report includes the Graduate Committee minutes of the October 9th meeting.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Again, it's a committee report and recommendation, so it doesn't need a second. Are there any questions about the Graduate Committee's recommendations from the October meeting? Seeing none, all in favor of approving the Graduate Committee's recommendations, and again recognizing that we are asking the Provost and the President to make those curriculum changes, please say aye. All opposed? Linda Mullen, she is supposed to be reporting for Gen Ed.

c. General Education and Core Curriculum Committee Report (Linda Mullen (COBA) for Michelle Cawthorn, COSM)

Lowell Mooney (COBA): I stopped by her office on the way here. There's a COBA Graduate Faculty meeting scheduled at 4:00 today. She said she needed to make an appearance there, and then would come over here, so she'll probably be in shortly.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Okay, If there are no objections, we can defer the Gen Education Committee report until later on the agenda. (There were no objections.)

I mentioned earlier, the recording not working too well, I am going to try something a little bit different and record Dr. Bartels' Provost's Report on my phone.

4. **Provost's Report: (Jean Bartels)**

Jean Bartels (Provost): Thankfully, this is a short report, as well, so there'll be less to transcribe and less for me to correct what is said, so I only really have a couple of things to report to you, and I will take any questions that you might have or what other issues that you would like to discuss.

SACSCOC

Two things I will speak to are what's happening and where we are with the SACSCOC accreditation and the reaffirmation, and I want to talk about the University *Statutes* that were passed by the faculty this semester. The SACSCOC for those that are keeping track, that report that report went in a while back. The off site SACSCOC reaffirmation team for our university did have the opportunity to review our materials and our reaffirmation report. We have yet to receive the feedback from that group. I expect it will come in sometime at the end of this month, or very early December. And it is at that moment that that we will know what areas they want us to do a focus report on. This is very typical as they review the report and have questions or want additional data or evidence. They will ask us for those things and we will take the time between December and the first part of January, when you are all having time off, to actually do whatever reviews we need to to complete that focus report if we are required to do. I am anticipating that there probably will be some areas; I know of very few, if any, reports that come through without being requested to do something focused about the report. So we'll see what areas they might want more information on and we'll take care of that in the next couple of months. To remind you again, the onsite visit team which is different than the team that reviewed us will be on campus on March 31st, until April 2nd (appropriately over April Fool's Day), and they will be focusing on areas that there are still questions about in our reaffirmation report, but their primary focus will be to look at our QEP and its plan and the budgeting resources for the plan and they'll spend a lot of time on that particular effort while they are here. We will certainly keep you informed; there'll be a moment in that visit when I know they are going to speak with faculty and probably will choose to have some time with the Senate Executive Committee. When we know more, I will let you know their agenda.

QEP

The other thing I want to talk about is the QEP and those of you who that were at the football game saw SGA announce the scope of the QEP. I would like to personally commend the SGA on taking the initiative to actually ??? for the students and the students were very robust in their responses to giving us suggestions for a slogan. The top slogan was chosen and we awarded the top three people, the top three slogans, at that football game, and announced on the big screen the actual slogans. The winning slogan is "Georgia Southern Eagles Write, Write, Write." If you come to the football games you will appreciate that "Georgia Southern Eagles Fight, Fight, Fight" is one of their regular cheers so it's kind of a takeoff on that. We are in the process of now working

with SGA and other interested students to look at marketing efforts to put the slogan out, with the help of our media department. The QEP goals have been published so that everyone knows what those are. And there's marketing materials that we will put out: banners, posters, pens, those kinds of things certainly advertise the QEP effort, it's about making it visible on campus. Again, I want to thank the SGA for their very active engagement in energizing students about the QEP.

Statutes

The only other thing I have to report is the approval of the Georgia Southern University *Statutes*. Remember we had a faculty vote to ask folks to support the changes and revisions to our *Statutes*. The System office has approved those *Statutes*, and accepted them. I thought it was interesting that it was the System office in this regard. Looking at the reports on the approval of our *Statutes* in prior times, it was always the Board of Regents who made the approval. Apparently that is not the case anymore and now the System office reviews them and they are acceptable, that level is where the approval takes place. So Georgia Southern University's revised *Statutes* are accepted and now of course we will be posting those, if they are not already, on the University Web Site. And with that I will conclude my report and ask for any questions that you might have on those topics or others. Yes.

Mark Hanna (COBA): This is a different matter. Earlier in the semester, we saw the results of an RFI dealing with the proportion of participants in graduation ceremonies that are not graduating. I know there's been a lot on your plate, but I wonder if the data in that report concerned you and if you've thought about a process by which that might be addressed.

Jean Bartels (Provost): I guess I didn't have the same reaction, I think that others did about the report, to be overly concerned about that report, I still have not (cannot understand) for the report actually to know that that's really an accurate depiction of what actually happens. I do know that, and I've said this before, with Senate decisions to allow people to march in graduation ceremonies, it was the request of faculty to have that happen.

Mark Hanna (COBA): To follow up, so it's on a plate of things to consider, would you give it any kind of priority, any kind of notion of its importance, either to the university or the students who are affected by it one way positively or negatively.

Jean Bartels (Provost) It's not right on the top of my list. Mark Hanna (COBA): Thank you.

Rob Pirro?? (CLASS): I heard there was an offer made for a QEP director, but it was declined; what is the status of that?

Jean Bartels (Provost): At the end of the day, the candidate liked what she saw on campus and then declined our offer, so what we did was reboot the process. Right now

we are searching again and that search closes the first part of December and we hope to have some candidates in the early part of January.

Rob Pirro (CLASS): So will that be a problem, when, I mean, will have someone hired by the time of the onsite visit happens?

Jean Bartels (Provost): I don't anticipate that that will be a problem. I anticipate by the time of the on site visit that an offer will have been made. Its just an unfortunate set of circumstances. The person that we offered the position to was perfect and everybody liked her, but she has a young family and at the last moment decided that she needed to not have such a demanding position. She said it was very difficult decision for her, she liked everything she saw, but also didn't have the time or energy to do both. Happy Thanksgiving everyone.

5. Senate Executive Committee Report: (Patricia Humphrey [COSM], Chair.)

Okay, going back, Dr. Mullen has arrived; can she give the GECC report?

Linda Mullen (COBA): Give me a second, okay?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: In the interim, the SEC Report since we last met, I did go up to the [USG Faculty Council](#) Meeting that was held at Georgia Gwinnett. It was an interesting day. Among other things that I know are of concern to people here was Board of Regents Policy 2.5.2, which says that any action by the Faculty Senate that is vetoed by the President must be communicated to the Chancellor's office. I specifically asked about that and I was told, yes, 2.5.2 is going to be enforced. Campus presidents who veto actions of the Senate must report those vetoes to the system office. Faculty Senates can act with a little "a" and university presidents can act with a capital A was a statement by Chancellor Huckaby. But at any rate, they are going to enforce that, and furthermore they also indicated that they would be rewriting that section to make it even more clear. Everything else that transpired, I transcribed all my notes and sent those out to the Faculty Senate after the fact, so if anybody has any questions about that please ask. It's been otherwise a quiet month. We had one Request for a Discussion Item from a faculty member who had questions about the policy for foreign students in terms of English language preparation. Turns out that she really didn't understand the policy quite clearly. The policy states that if you have lower than 590 TOEFL, you must have SAT reading score 510 or higher, or other combinations depending on when the test was taken. If a test score is old, and the student has not been using English of late, their actual ability now may not be what it was when they took the test. If their score falls between 520 and 509, students are actually tested when they get to campus and based on the testing that's done on campus, may or may not be placed in an English Language course. Turns out that most people actually pass that exam here. Not passing could be good for a student in terms of understanding spoken English or

being able to speak English, so it actually works out fairly well. Any questions so far? Yes, Rob

Rob Pirro (CLASS): I know that the, President Keel, asked, resisted the interpretation of 2.5.2. Have you spoken with him, and is he now on board with the idea that this administration has to report to the Chancellor when they veto?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: I did ask him about it. He says he understands.

Helen Bland (JPHCOPH): See if I can make this work. I just want to say that that's very encouraging. It's nice to know that the Senate and the Senators can act, because I was having difficulty understanding what the purpose of this body was, so I am very highly encouraged. Thank you for your follow-up on that.

Janice Steirn (CLASS): Okay, so I'm a little concerned that with a capital "A", and a lower case "a", that it might not necessarily solve the problem because I don't think the problem was with the policy; the problem was whether we really act or not. And by saying well the Senate doesn't really act on most decisions, then there's nothing really to veto. So I mean, I suppose I have to wait until I see what their clarification is that they are going to write, but I do hope that when they write the clarification they make it clearer that a lower case act, is still an act, you know, and so that a veto of that would need to be reported.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: For example, they said that the Senate can act in terms of, for example, curriculum. The President can act on behalf of the University and University can do certain things that the Senate does not have that power. Those are a couple of examples that they gave in terms of little "a" versus capital "A." So let's see what happens. There was also an interesting comment that we were one of just a few institutions (UGA being another one) where actions of the Faculty Senate must actually be approved by the President to take affect. The majority of the UGA, University System, the Georgia institutions, actions of the Senate are actions unless the President vetoes them. Our *Statutes* say that either way the president accepts or vetoes. I don't know. Ultimately, it is usually rare that the President vetoes them and as the Chancellor said there is some disconnect going on between presidents and their senates in terms of the president's vetoing actions of the senate. They want to know about it. That's all I can say about that at this point. I don't know how long it will take them to revise BOR policy. That's the end of the Senate Executive Committee's report.

Elections of Faculty Senate Moderator for AY 2015 - 2016 (Pat Humphrey 2015-2016 Moderator)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Next item on the agenda is the election of the Faculty Senate Moderator for AY 2015-2016. The floor is open for nominations.

Lowell Mooney (COBA): I'd like to nominate Pat Humphrey for next year's Senate Moderator.

(seconded)

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Are there any further nominations from the floor?

I make a motion to close the nominations.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: A motion has been made to close the nominations.

Seconded.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: All in favor of Pat Humphrey for Senate Moderator for AY 2015-2016, please say aye. All opposed? Thank you. All right. Is there any new business? The Gen Ed Report?

Linda Mullen (COBA) If anybody has any questions on it, that's all Michelle Cawthorn is the chair, but she had sent the minutes on, so if anyone had questions after reading the minutes. I'll try to answer.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Seeing none, I guess that takes care of it. Is there any new business? Is there any old business? She just asked a question, is there anything in those minutes that constitutes an action that the Senate needs to approve. We talked a lot about doing things in the future, but

Linda Mullen (COBA) I don't think at this point there was anything. Rebecca, do you remember?

Rebecca Ziegler (LIB): I don't think so.

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Ok, I guess we should vote to accept them since they are a Senate committee. So we vote to accept the Gen Ed Curriculum Committee minutes. All those in favor say aye. All opposed?

Pat Humphrey (COSM) Chair, SEC, and Senate Moderator: Okay, Announcements from the vice president? Announcements from the floor? Do I have a motion to adjourn? So moved and seconded.

- 6. New Business**
- 7. Announcements: Vice Presidents**
- 8. Announcements from the Floor**
- 9. Adjournment.**

